Studies in English

Volume 2 Article 13

1961

Vol. 2 (1961): Full Issue

Journal Editors

Studies in English

The University of Mississippi Department of English

The University of Mississippi

Studies in English

Volume Two

University, Mississippi
1961

The University of Mississippi
Studies in English

The University of Mississippi Studies in English is published annually by the Department of English of the University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi. The subscription price for each volume is two dollars.

To

DUDLEY ROBERT HUTCHERSON

(1902-1960)

Professor of English

and

Dean of the Graduate School

CONTENTS

Milton's Adam as a Lover

Dudley R. Hutcherson

[*Editor's Note: The following article was written by Dean Hutcherson shortly before his death in September, 1960. It was read at the meeting of the South Central Modern Language Association in Oklahoma City, November 11, 1960. Although Dean Hutcherson intended to make certain revisions in his paper before it was published, the article is now printed substantially as he left it.*]

The conduct of Milton's Adam as a lover and husband can well serve—except during the few scenes when the enormity of his sin and his masculine inclination to dramatize excessively his agony overcame him—as a model to his sons. The present intention is to consider the sources of Adam's competence in these roles. Did the author of *Paradise Lost* find in the Adams of his predecessors the knowledge and the techniques that his first of men utilizes attractively and effectively? Were these qualities derived from Milton's reading or from his imagination? Or did the poet draw upon his own experience? Much has been made of Adam's statements about women in *Paradise Lost* as reflecting the bitter wisdom that Milton had acquired through the years. Does Adam also demonstrate that his creator had learned well other and more pleasant pages from the textbook of marital life?

The Adam whom Milton first introduces to us—and to Satan, who looks on with burning envy—is Adam, the lover. He is also an Adam who requires, as the laws of Milton's universe dictate, "subjection" from his mate, but Eve already has learned that he prefers that this obedience be rendered with "sweet reluctant amorous delay." Hand in hand Adam and Eve stroll through the Garden, "the loveliest pair," the poet tells us and with apparently his chief interest in only one

aspect of their lives, "that ever since in love's embraces met." That frequently throughout the poem Adam and Eve hold hands or touch each other with meaningful gestures, has been noted by Svendsen.[1] In no version of the story other than Milton's does the writer make use of these appealing and human devices. Adam and Eve walk past their unseen observer and seat themselves "on the soft downy bank damasked with flowers." While they enjoy their "supper-fruits," there is not wanting, the poet tells us, "youthful dalliance as beseems/Fair couple linked in happy nuptial league,/Alone as they." Although in a perfect state the enjoyment must have been mutual, it is to be supposed that it was initiated and directed by Adam, whose "absolute rule" over his lovely companion was stressed in the first lines of the description of the noble pair.

"Sole partner and sole part of all these joys/Dearer thyself than all," Adam begins the first words to Eve to which we are privy, and completes the frame of the somewhat stern reminder of God's prohibition of the Tree of Knowledge with the declaration that even if it were toilsome to care for the plants and flowers of Paradise "yet with thee [it] were sweet." Eve's response reminds him of their first meeting, and concludes with a submissive half-embrace. Milton's Adam is not at loss for a moment, as his creator may have been with Mary Powell a quarter of a century earlier. Smiling with "superior love," he presses Eve's lips "with kisses pure," and Satan turns away in envy and jealousy.

In only a few of the many other versions of the story of Paradise do the authors present details of Adam's conduct when he and Eve make their first appearance. The most elaborate account is probably in Du Bartas, which Milton knew in Joshua Sylvester's translation, in which Adam "ravisht" by "the rare beauties of his new-come Half," begins "kissing her kindly" while he extols her many virtues.[2] In *Adamus Exul* of Hugo Grotius, Adam reminiscing with Eve about her creation, recalls that "when I saw thee, sweet amazement seized upon/My still inactive limbs; a new flame melted me/With all the

fires of love," but there is no further statement of Adam's reactions.[3] Salandra's Adam is even more complimentary, if possible—certainly he is more profuse—than Milton's in the tributes to his mate, but he confines himself to talk.[4] Apollyon in his report to Beelzebub in Vondel's *Lucifer, Truerspel* describes how Adam "embraced his bride, and she her man."[5] In the many other accounts, though, no attention is given in the introduction of Adam and Eve to their response to each other.

In the nuptial scene in *Paradise Lost* Adam conducts himself not with timid uncertainty but with an assurance and a self-confident competence that usually are the products of much experience. It is true, as stated in the legends of the Jews[6] and elsewhere, and as C. S. Lewis emphasized strongly,[7] that Adam was supposedly created fully possessed of all the knowledge and the abilities that he needed. If it is granted that this maturity was assigned to him by tradition, it is still to be determined whether the specific manifestations of it that appear in *Paradise Lost* come from the earlier Adams or from Milton. Many of the other accounts—Avitus,[8] Du Bartas,[9] Grotius,[10] the legends of the Jews,[11] Pareus,[12] and Beaumont[13] among them—mention or describe the marriage scene, but in no other version is there an Adam who possesses the sophistication and the ease of Milton's first of men.

That Milton's Adam had never existed in the preceding accounts is impressively apparent when Adam awakens at the side of Eve. It is difficult to believe that Adam's masterly conduct in these charming moments could have derived its rightness from anything but Milton's many years with women. Although genius can never be denied the privilege of vicarious achievement, it would be a naive reader indeed who could be persuaded that the skill displayed by Adam in this scene had its source in the author's reading and in his imagination.

On his side, leaning half-raised, Adam bends over the sleeping Eve, admiring her beauty and feeling his great love for her. Before he begins to speak, his hand reaches out to touch her softly, another

instance of Milton's continual use of the hand as a medium and a symbol of their love. "Awake," Adam whispers, "My fairest, my espoused, my latest found/Heaven's last best gift, my ever new delight." Then follows the scene of Eve's frightened awakening, of her clinging to Adam while she pours out the story of her dream (the dream, incidentally, an addition by Milton), and of Adam's explanation of the dream.

Then comes what is perhaps Milton's master stroke in his highly successful delineation of Adam in the role of lover. Eve, cheered by her husband's psychological analysis of the dream, plays perfectly the woman's part, summoning two gentle tears in each eye. The first pair Eve wipes away with her hair. Adam abandons immediately his role as a scientist and is the lover again. He leans down and kisses away the other two tears. This touch is from the hand—or more exactly, the lips—of an expert. No precedent for it is to be found in all of the other pages about Adam and Eve.

Eve in *Paradise Lost* leaves no doubt of her high opinion of her husband's skill in love. While Raphael explains the universe to Adam, Eve goes out to tend her flowers, not that she in incapable of understanding the Seraph's discourse, but she prefers to have Adam repeat it to her—and also she is aware, apparently by instinct, of how much man is flattered by woman's seeming regard for his knowledge. Furthermore, Milton adds, Eve knows that Adam "would intermix/Graceful digressions, and solve high dispute/With conjugal caresses; from his lips/Not words alone pleased her." Thus the poet seems to take the occasion to remind us of Adam's attractive competence as a consort, although it may be suggested that Milton's fascination with Eve's charm, or his understanding of her frivolity is also involved.

The delightful colloquy between God and Adam, as reported by the latter to Raphael, about God's providing Adam with a mate is evidence that Milton wanted the importance of a mate to be on Adam's mind from the beginning. It is significant also, in determining in what aspects of life Milton was interested, that in no other

version of the Adam and Eve story does a dialogue take place between God and Adam about a mate similar to the discussion in *Paradise Lost*. This charming exchange apparently is entirely John Milton's invention.

Adam's description to Raphael of his infatuation with Eve and of his first hours with her reveals his imprisonment to her glorious loveliness and grace, and also that he is entirely sure of himself in his relations with his wife. Raleigh may be correct, though, in his contention that Adam's and Milton's technique is faulty in that the beautiful eulogy "When I approach her loveliness" should have been addressed to Eve herself and not to Raphael.[14]

Is this beautiful and attractive creature an older poet's dream of what Mary Powell should have been, and, more to our present inquiry, is this the sophisticated self-assurance which Milton wishes that he could recall from his days with Mary, or perhaps which he does remember from his life with the two other wives? Raphael's sharp reproof is accepted by Adam, but this creator never allows the Angel to subdue completely his earthly host. In the end Adam asks the question about heavenly love that flusters Raphael. In Milton's Great Scheme, which he inherited, Adam must pay soon for his subjection to Eve, and there is no intention here to deny what Milton considered the greater concern. It is of interest, though, that Adam and his curiosity about love-making in Heaven almost steal the scene.

That the Adam of *Paradise Lost* is wisely skillful in more than one aspect of his relations with Eve appears in the "mild answer" that he returns to her suggestion that they work apart, in the "healing words" that he continues to offer, and in the epithet with which he attempts to win the discussion. "Daughter of God and Man, immortal Eve." He does let himself become somewhat annoyed when he gets nowhere with his efforts, but not even the perfect man can be expected to keep his poise forever in the face of a woman's persistence. Adam has been holding Eve's hand hopefully during the

debate, another of the several instances of Milton's effective use of this very human gesture.

While Eve is away from him with Satan, Adam weaves "of choicest flowers a garland to adorn/Her tresses," a gesture that seems at first additional evidence of Adam's knowingness as a lover. It might be argued, however, that although the Milton-Adam type is gentle, he is not a weaver of flowers, but perhaps we are too far away from the pastoral school to appreciate Milton's point of view.

Adam's speeches after Eve tells him of her act and when he decides to eat the fruit are the eloquent declarations of a hopeless prisoner to a woman's charm—great speeches for a great lover if the story were rewritten as a love story. These speeches contribute nothing, though, to the present inquiry. They are highly effective rhetorical poetry, but they are not reflections of practical experience. On the other hand, it is perhaps of significance to this study that the detailed account of how Adam and Eve exhaust themselves in their lust is to be found only in Milton. Bar Cepha, whose *De Paradiso* was available to Milton in Masius' Latin translation, shares with the English poet the emphasis on this episode, but not the effective description.[15] C. S. Lewis comments that Adam's words to Eve at the beginning of this scene of unrestrained physical dissipation strike exactly the right note in terms of Adam's circumstances and his attitude.[16]

Adam's behavior during the "fruitless hours" of "mutual accusation" after he and Eve awaken from the exhaustion that follows their dissipation and during the Son's judgment is the reverse side of the coin, the display of the male who discovers that his self-assured competence has helped to betray him into neglecting the primary values. His misery during the night as he suffers dramatically on the cold ground of the Garden is, Don Cameron Allen suggests, "the Christian echo to the sleepless nights and amorous complaints of the 'starved lover' of the Petrarchian tradition."[17] Adam in his

great agony does not think of his way with Eve. There are now more important concerns. Adam lies alone.

Whatever his previous display of bad temper and his histrionic suffering, once Adam permits himself to be moved by Eve's despair and humility, he is again the knowing husband, but now, as the occasion requires, also the understanding, gentle, affectionate partner. Whether Eve's prostration at Adam's feet had its origin in Milton's recollection of Mary Powell's return to him, the last scenes between the parents of the human race show a man of experience in domestic life. And then, as the poem moves toward its close, there is one last flash of the old Adam, the delight and enthusiasm he exhibits when Michael presents to him the vision of amorous activities among Adam's descendants. Immediately Milton, with an eye now only to the fundamental issue, has the Angel sternly reprove Adam. The reader has not forgotten, however, the Adam of much better days.

In no other account is there any attempt to establish for Adam the skill as a lover and the competence in his relations with Eve that are depicted effectively by Milton in the scenes that have just been reviewed. Nothing of this kind is to be found, for example, in Avitus, Beaumont, Du Bartas, the Caedmonian story, the English dramatic cycles. Some of the commentators in the middle ages argue the problem of whether there were physical relations before the Fall.[18] Other medieval expositors forego any possibility of elaborating on the life of Adam and Eve by insisting that there was only a very short time between the Creation and the Fall.[19] In Andreini's *L'Adamo,* Adam speaks fluently of his love for Eve,[20] and in the *Adamo Caduto* of Salandra, Adam and Eve discuss love;[21] but in neither work are the qualities of Milton's Adam anticipated. The *Adamus Exul* of Grotius contains some talk, mainly on the part of Eve, of their nuptial love, but nothing more.[22]

The very young Milton expressed in Latin elegies I and VII his interest in girls and in Elegy V his sensual enthusiasm for love in its most physical aspects; both expressions were conventional, but

also both were apparently personal. True, he provided an epilogue to the Latin elegies in which he recanted, but it is often pointed out that a mature man really ashamed of his love poems and having lost interest in what they concerned behaved in a peculiar fashion in publishing the same poems twenty years after his renunciation. The sonnets in Italian are in part traditional love poems, but they also express the young poet's own interest in an attractive girl. Love is the subject of the first English sonnet. If *Comus* represents the attitude of the man who wrote it, as it is assumed that it does, Milton by his twenty-sixth year had determined upon at least a sparse temperance, and probably even looked upon celibacy as an ideal state.

Eight years after the production of *Comus,* Milton in the Smectymnyus tract, writing in defense of his past life, recalls how he had learned from the stories of chivalry "what a noble vertue chastity must be." He states emphatically, however, that he does not regard marriage as an unchastity. In a very few months, though, Milton in the famous lines in the *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* takes another look at life in the chilling light of day, or more exactly of one of the gray mornings after his child-bride had left him.

> And lastly, is it not strange [he inquires] though that many who have spent their youth chastly, are in some things not so quick-sighted, while they haste too eagerly to light the nuptial torch; nor is it therefore that for a modest error a man should forfeit so great a happiness, and no charitable means to release him. Since they who have liv'd most loosely, by reason of their bold accustoming, prove most successfull in their matches, because their wild affections, unsettling at will, have been as so many divorces to teach them experience.[23]

Milton's words must not be misread to support a license in personal conduct that he never at any time advocated or defended. What is found in this passage that is of interest here is that Milton, well

past thirty, apparently had been forced suddenly to a mature appreciation of the value of experience in certain aspects of life. Is it too much to assume that in the years that followed he paid careful heed to the lesson he had learned so painfully, and that he slowly acquired in his three marriages the knowledge that he considered of high value?

The question of what, if anything, Milton's own experience, acquired as is that of many men after he had learned the painful cost of inexperience, contributed to Adam's skill in love cannot be separated, of course, from the problem of Milton's share in Adam's other actions and statements. It is apparently an error to read into Adam's conduct and expressions too much that represents his creator's personal life, just as it is a mistake to hold that Milton in no instance permits Adam to reflect the poet's own feelings or experience. The difficulty obviously is to determine what Adam derives from Milton and what he doesn't. Grierson states that no one was ever, in one way, more susceptible to experience than Milton.[24] Raleigh declares that Milton "was extraordinarily susceptible to the attractions of feminine beauty and grace. Adam's confessions are his own . . . ."[25] Saurat, whose views are sometimes subject to question, speaks of "Milton's fundamentally sensual nature on the one side, and his pride of intellect, on the other, which come naturally to this compromise: sensual love is praiseworthy and sacred when it is made legitimate by the approval of reason."[26] Milton was not subject to the qualities that ruin most men, Tillyard thinks; "he has no part in their levity and their terror of standing alone . . . . For him personally sex was the great pitfall. And so he cannot refrain from grafting sex onto the structure of the fall."[27] And when Adam breaks out in his bitter prediction of the ills that women bring to men, it is, Tillyard states, "Milton's own voice, unable through the urgency of personal experience to keep silent."[28] Not to be overlooked, though, is McColley's reminder that although Milton's personal experience with Mary Powell may perhaps at least have lent vigor to

Adam's statements, the ideas that Milton expressed were those usually found in Christian discussions of marriage.[29]

In no other version of the story of Paradise, or in all other treatments combined, does an Adam participate who even approaches the effectiveness of Milton's Adam in love. It must be taken into account, of course, that the man who gave to Adam these talents might have learned them from his reading. For example, Douglas Bush suggests that Adam and Eve after they had eaten the fruit behaved somewhat in the manner of Paris and Helen or of Zeus and Hera when the goddess assumed the girdle of Aphrodite.[30] The similarity of Adam's night of agony to that of a Petrarchian lover already has been mentioned. Beyond two or three possible parallels, however, it is very difficult to find literary sources for this part of Adam's life. Nor can Milton's imagination be discounted, but again we have no evidence. Milton did declare shortly after his child-bride had left him that in some ways it was to a man's advantage to have had experience with women. That experience the poet must have gained, because Mary returned, and then there was briefly Katherine, and, after her, Elizabeth, and there is no record that he did not live with them very successfully and very happily, although he must have been as sharply aware at times of their human failings as they were of his. May we not be permitted then to wonder whether what the Adam of *Paradise Lost* knew about women and love, and which none of the other Adams knew, in the main had not been learned through the years by John Milton?

FOOTNOTES

[1]Kester Svendsen, *Milton and Science* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 111-112.

[2]Guillaume Du Bartas, *La Sepmaine* (1578), quoted from Watson Kirkconnell, *The Celestial Cycle* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952), p. 58.

[3]Hugo Grotius, *Adamus Exul* (1601), quoted from Kirkconnell *The Celestial Cycle,* p. 139.

[4]Serafino della Salandra, *Adamo Caduto* (1647), in Kirkconnell, *The Celestial Cycle,* pp. 303-304.

[5]Joost van den Vondel, *Lucifer Treurspel* (1654), quoted from Kirkconnell, *The Celestial Cycle*, p. 366.

[6]Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909-1938), I, 59.

[7]C. S. Lewis, *A Preface to Paradise Lost* (London: Oxford University Press, 1942), pp. 112-114.

[8]Avitus, *Poematum de Mosaicae Gestis, Libri Quinque*, in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, LIX, 328.

[9]Du Bartas, *La Sepmaine*, quoted from Kirkconnell, *The Celestial Cycle*, p. 58.

[10]Grocius, *Adamus Exul*, in Kirkconnell, *The Celestial Cycle*, p. 139.

[11]Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, I, 68.

[12]See Arnold Williams, *The Common Expositor: An Account of the Commentaries on Genesis*, 1527-1633 (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1948), p. 88.

[13]Joseph Beaumont, *Psyche*, or *Love's Mystery* (Cambridge, 1702), p. 83.

[14]Walter Raleigh, *Milton* (London: Edward Arnold, 1900), pp. 143-144.

[15]See Grant McColley, *Paradise Lost* (Chicago: Packard and Company, 1940), p. 178.

[16]Lewis, *A Preface to Paradise Lost*, p. 124.

[17]Don Cameron Allen, *The Harmonious Vision: Studies in Milton's Poetry* (Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1954), p. 78.

[18]See Williams, *The Common Expositor*, pp. 89-90.

[19]*Ibid.*, p. 137.

[20]Giambattista Andreini, *L'Adamo* (1613), in Kirkconnell, *The Celestial Cycle*, pp. 241, 253, 255-256.

[21]Salandra, *Adamo Caduto*, in Kirkconnell, *The Celestial Cycle*, p. 327.

[22]Grotius, *Adamus Exul*, in Kirkconnell, *The Celestial Cycle*, p. 203.

[23]*The Works of John Milton* (21 vols.; New York: Columbia University Press, 1931-1938), III, 394-395.

[24]H. J. C. Grierson, *Cross Currents in English Literature of the Seventeenth Century* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1948), p. 237.

[25]Raleigh, *Milton*, p. 145.

[26]Dennis Saurat, *Milton, Man and Thinker* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1944), pp. 48-49.

[27]E. M. W. Tillyard, *Milton* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1930), p. 265.

[28]*Ibid.*

[29]McColley, *Paradise Lost*, p. 83.

[30]Douglas Bush, *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry* (Minneapolis, Minn.: The University of Minnesota Press, 1932), p. 278.

Browning's "Childe Roland" in Light of Ruskin's *Modern Painters*

Tom J. Truss, Jr.

Since the discussions of the Browning Society in the early 1880's, the usual criticism of "Childe Roland to the Dark Tower Came" has been from the viewpoint that the poem belongs to the tradition of "quest" literature growing out of the metrical romance; and most attempts to arrive at its meaning, both then and later, have been within terms of the tradition.[1] The approach is not surprising. Readers of the 1870's were having a close look at chivalric searches composed by the laureate. The decade began shortly after the publication of a group of *Idylls*. People were reading of Lancelot's and Galahad's search for Tennyson's symbol for a higher pantheism, the Holy Grail. They were reading of the disillusionment of naive and youthful Pelleas as he sought after Etarre's faithful love. Somewhat closer to the point, they were following the untried Gareth as he subdued a great man-beast, who proved a mere boy in disguise, and thereby won the hand of an erstwhile scornful Lynnette. The source for this *Idyll,* Malory's "Tale of Sir Gareth of Orkney,"[2] has many details which appear in Browning's "Childe Roland."[3] Tennyson's idyllic activity extended into the 1880's. In its bibliographical aspect, the laureate divided "Geraint and Enid" into two parts in 1884, and in the following year he issued the last *Idyll* of the series, "Balin and Balan." With so many quests of the laureate in the literary atmosphere, it is no wonder that Nettleship's comment on "Childe Roland" published in 1890 is vaguely applicable to any random grouping of Tennyson's unfallen knights: "The purpose with which that band of knights set out may have been any purpose

you please which had the truth and purity for its objects."[4] A recent analysis draws inverse conclusions from the same tradition: "Roland's quest has a coherent structure because it repudiates the conventional motives of the search for the Grail."[5] The point of departure for these approaches is understandable, but by looking for meaning within a broad *genre* rather than within the poet's own imaginative associations, these writers might be misleading.

According to another recent investigation,[6] the nightmarish tone and imagery of the poem have distinctly Victorian points of reference, and should be associated with the ravages of the Industrial Revolution —child labor, malnutrition, and in general, economic oppression of the working classes and exploitation of natural scenery. In fact, specific notions, imagery, and language of Elizabeth Barrett's "Cry of the Children" are seen again in "Childe Roland." The Dark Tower symbolizes destructiveness and brute force, an idea to be derived from the meaning of the *tower*-image in the poem written on the following day, "Love among the Ruins." The meaning of the tower flashes back over the landscape the Childe has crossed and establishes lust for gold as the source of the waste, lust reaching up to governments themselves. At the time of writing, Browning was in Paris, and was significantly watching the martial pageantry in behalf of Louis Napoleon from his window. This extremely rewarding interpretation gives a great deal of concrete meaning to the poem, but by taking Browning almost at his word ("a kind of dream—I had to write it"), Erdman does not probe far for additional possibilities. I propose, for reasons which shall emerge later, that Roland's quest is related to the poet's search for his art.

Evidence is found in certain details of Browning's personal life. At the time of writing "Childe Roland," a marital difference over divergent political sympathies had cropped up in the lives of the Brownings, and the feeling was no doubt deepened by the precarious imbalance in family ties which the husband and wife had contended with the preceding summer.[7] In a curious and revealing way, three

poems, written at this time on three successive days,[8] serve to illustrate in sharp contrasts Browning's attempt to re-define the meaning of love: "Women and Roses," "Childe Roland," and "Love among the Ruins." "Women and Roses" is full of imagery connoting the frustrations of love. In the poem Browning singles out one rose (is it his wife?) whose "term is reached,/Whose leaf hangs loose and bleached;/Bees pass it unimpeached."[9] Another rose ("women of faded ages") takes precedence, however, over the first; "They circle their rose on my rose tree." In the conclusion Browning tries to resolve the problem. "What shall arrive with the cycle's change?" he asks, and then asserts, "I will make an Eve, be the artist that began her,/Shaped her to his mind." But in the final line, the other women intrude with their rose. One rose was obviously fighting with another in Browning's imagination. When one remembers the domestic tension, the personal meaning underlying the imagery becomes clear.

Fused with this circumstance is another, of an entirely different nature. Browning had resolved to write a poem a day.[10] The desire to be an artist and fashion an Eve, which concluded "Women and Roses," reveals a direction for such a resolution. On the following day, however, Browning fashioned not Eve but Childe Roland. By this time in his life, he had written numerous poems about love, certain ones of them under the inspiration of his own beloved.[11] At this moment of marital difference, however, a poem on "Eve" might pose a difficult, frustrating task for him. Furthermore, with the political storms of France raging outside his personal life,[12] a Pippa-esque view of the world was perhaps similarly difficult to establish. The frustrations in one area and the hoplessness of the other were enough to make Browning momentarily unable to write about anything. The poem "Childe Roland" might well contain, then, a dream of an artist in a quandary over his subject.

Additional insights can be gained from a survey of Browning's possible connection with the ideas of Ruskin's *Modern Painters*.[13] On August 24, 1848, Mrs. Browning wrote from Italy to Miss Mitford

that she and her husband were in the midst of Ruskin's treatise.[14] *Men and Women* (1855), the first collection of Browning's poems published after that date, contains a number of significant works dealing with art and sculpture—"Fra Lippo Lippi," "The Statue and the Bust," "Protus," "Andrea del Sarto."

In Ruskin, Browning found a person whose interests were in many ways similar to his own. In *Modern Painters,* for instance, Browning encountered this description of a portrait: it "may have neglected or misrepresented the features, but may have given the flash of the eyes, and the peculiar radiance of the lip, seen on him only in his hours of highest mental excitement . . . . [The painter] gives the stamp of the soul upon the flesh."[15] In opposing his Prior's aesthetics ("Give us no more body than shows soul!"), Fra Lippo Lippi argues with a similar approach:

> Now is this sense, I ask?
> A fine way to paint soul, by painting body
> So ill, the eye can't stop there,
> . . . . . .
> Take the prettiest face,
> . . . is it so pretty
> You can't discover if it means hope, fear,
> Sorrow or joy? won't beauty go with these?
> Suppose I've made her eyes all right and blue,
> Can't I take breath and try to add life's flash,
> And then add soul and brighten them threefold? (p. 344)

In an attempt to open men's eyes to the world, Ruskin elsewhere discusses the delights of visual perception: "Unless the minds of men are particularly directed to the impressions of sight, objects pass perpetually before the eyes without conveying any impression to the brain at all; and so pass actually unseen, not merely unnoticed."[16] Lippo uses a similar notion in his defense of painting: "we're made so that we love/First when we see them [God's works] painted, things we have passed/Perhaps a hundred times nor cared to see" (p. 345).

The conclusion to Volume I of *Modern Painters* might well contain Lippo's ideas: "Let then every picture be painted with earnest intention of impressing on the spectator some elevated emotion, and exhibiting to him some one particular, exalted beauty. Let a real subject be carefully selected, in itself suggestive of, and replete with, this feeling and beauty."[17] If Lippo's statements are close to Browning's viewpoint in regard to art,[18] they are also close to Ruskin's. The sharp contrast between Lippo's brilliant, ebullient monologue and Roland's bleak, grim travelogue certainly points up the different states of mind occasioning the two poems. Acquainted with Ruskin's aesthetics in 1851-1852, Browning wrote "Childe Roland" at a time when he was unable to attain the heights which Ruskin or Lippo would demand.

The poem itself is quite familiar. Having turned from the malicious cripple, Roland started across the countryside. The natural scenery was bleak, was stunted beyond hope. Next he thought of those he had known, Cuthbert and Giles, but he remembered that one had turned coward and the other traitor. He then forded a river full of floating heads, and entered a realm which, suffering from the ravages of the Industrial Revolution, was full of abandoned machinery. Irrelevantly, the bosom friend of Apollyon, a great black bird, signaled the beginning of the end. With the mountains looming around him, the traveler suddenly spied the object of his search, the Dark Tower, "without a counterpart/In the whole world." A glimmer of day flashed and was gone, and noise was heard everywhere. The traveler then saw lost adventurers ranging along the hillside, who composed "a living frame/For one more picture" (pp. 287-289).

There is no reason to assume that the lost adventurers, his peers, are members of the Band which began the search with Roland. Roland, I suggest, typifies an artist who, separated from his contemporaries (Browning had been living away from England for about five years), successively finds nature, humanity, and finally civilization itself quite depressing, and he meets images of past artists

at the Dark Tower. A month before the writing of the poem, Browning finished his essay on Shelley,[19] a major paragraph of which lauded Shelley's "sympathy with the oppressed" (p. 1012).

In a rather peculiar way "Childe Roland" hints at Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress,* which like Roland's trip is "in the similitude of a dream." Pilgrim's quest for the Celestial City is broadly parallel to Roland's search for the Dark Tower, and details in Bunyan's work possibly animate the imagery of Browning's poem. Worldly-Wiseman, for instance, turned the Pilgrim away from the path to Mount Zion in order to find Legality. Pilgrim soon arrived beside a hill which was about to topple over on him, very much like the enclosing mountains in "Childe Roland." In addition, in the Valley of Humiliation, Pilgrim successfully fought against Apollyon. The only instance in which this proper noun appears in Browning's poetry is in "Childe Roland."[20] Apollyon's bird brushed against the traveler as he arrived at the locale of the Tower. Roland's trip is curiously suggestive of what Browning would have submitted Bunyan's Pilgrim to. Browning's hero is less introspective, more self-reliant, more adventuresome, nor does he need to be rescued from the toppling hill by an Evangelist. Foundation exists elsewhere for this Bunyan-like aspect of the poem. In 1878 Browning confidently satirized Bunyan in "Ned Bratts." A scoundrel has just been converted by reading about a hero named "Christmas" in a book obviously by Bunyan. He and his wife break in upon a trial and demand that they summarily be hanged for their crimes. If they are not, he cries, Satan will certainly undo their conversion and overcome them before they die. One sees here a deep cleavage between Bunyan's and Browning's views of human nature. In Bunyan's terms, Childe Roland would be a fool for following the advice of Browning's evil-eyed cripple. But through just such a folly, Browning's Roland achieves his goal by reaching the Tower, which in this instance parallels Roland himself, "blind as the fool's heart." The foolish element in the poem is ironic, for Roland is no more foolish than the poet of "How It Strikes a

Contemporary," who merely seems to be so to the casual observer. Furthermore, Roland's victory in reaching the Tower on the signal of Bunyan's embodiment of sin, Apollyon, might be ironically a thinly optimistic response to Bunyan's guilt-ridden Pilgrim.

Pursuing this line of reasoning, one sees in "Childe Roland" a definition of the agony and confusion which a poet endures as he sets out to write a poem. He knows where he wants to go—to the Dark Tower which others have reached but which they cannot lead him to. He must find his own way unaided—by Evangelist or by Shelley, for that matter. This is precisely the same sequence which Browning put David through in "Saul." The psalmist tried to revive the king with various kinds of traditional poetry—lyrics, heroics—before he was able to stir the warrior. Only a truly original approach was successful. "I saw and I spoke," David relates; "I spoke as I saw: I report" (p. 183). The interaction in the poem "Saul" between an artist, his art, and a beholder is summed up probably by Fra Lippo Lippi's rather Ruskinian idea: "God uses us to help each other so,/Lending our minds out." Browning (as Roland) depicts the difficulties involved in lending one's mind out. The artist is driven to produce (in the specific instance of "Childe Roland" by a resolution), but he is surprised by the art object, the Dark Tower, which ultimately appears before him. His "vexed beating stuffed and stopped-up brain,/Heart, or whate'er else," as Andrea del Sarto put it (p. 346), takes him to the end of his journey, the finished poem, which is "without a counterpart/In the whole world." Grotesque like Browning's own poetry, it is a squat round turret. Within these terms then, the tower is an aesthetic embodiment of the raw material that has preceded it. The subject matter for a poem unfolds in the mind of the poet, and "burningly" the poem appears all at once. Furthermore, "blind as the fool's heart," it reflects something of the poet. The inspiration naturally dies, for it has served its purpose. If this interpretation is valid, the riddle of the death of Roland is solved, for the paradox of defeat amidst triumph and triumph amidst

defeat is explained. An inspiration dissipates upon the completion of a poem.

I suggest, then, two broad areas of meaning for "Childe Roland." First, the poem is a disguise. It covers up the struggle that the poet was having in writing a poem when personal and political affairs were running counter to his principles. That Browning would be hesitant to commit himself to the meaning of the dream is obvious enough when one recalls the companion poems "House" and "Shop." If Browning did unlock his heart, he would have tried to hide its contents behind elaborate imagery. He perhaps approved of the glib interpretation, "he that endureth to the end shall be saved,"[21] to minimize further speculation. By extension, a second meaning emerges. In the richly associative and confluent imagery, one detects an allegory of an artist's struggle with his materials. Browning's poetry belongs to the objective rather than the subjective order, to use the terms he himself employed in his *Essay on Shelley.* In communicating in the former classification, the poet gives such externals as strike a note of sympathy in the mind and heart of his reader. Intellectual aspects must be transformed into creatures of flesh and blood and into real objects. This process proved difficult for Browning as Ben Ezra. In a statement using the ambiguous word *hardly,* which can be defined as "with difficulty," some "thoughts [were] hardly to be packed/Into a narrow act" (p. 385). "Childe Roland" in this interpretation thus depicts the parturition of a poem. The confused poet comprehends his goal only abstractly, he has to traverse an uncharted wilderness to reach it, and he finally stumbles surprised upon it.

FOOTNOTES

[1]W. C. DeVane lists many of them in the footnotes of the *Browning Handbook* (New York, 1955), p. 231. Curtis Dahl typifies recent approaches in "The Victorian Wasteland," *College English,* XVI (1955), 341-347, reprinted in *Victorian Literature: Modern Essays in Criticism,* Austin Wright, ed. (New York, 1961), pp. 32-40.

[2]Harold Littledale, *Essays on Lord Tennyson's Idylls of the King* (London, 1912), Chapter VI.

[3]Lionel Stevenson, "The Pertinacious Victorian Poets," in *Victorian Literature: Modern Essays in Criticism,* p. 24. This essay is reprinted, with additions, from the *University of Toronto Quarterly,* XXI (1952), 232-245.

[4]John T. Nettleship, *Robert Browning: Essays and Thoughts* (London), p. 95.

[5]John Lindberg, "Grail-Themes in Browning's 'Childe Roland,'" *Victorian Newsletter,* No. 16 (Fall, 1959), p. 27.

[6]David V. Erdman, "Browning's Industrial Nightmare," *PQ,* XXXVI (1957), 417-435.

[7]Betty Miller, *Robert Browning: A Portrait* (New York, 1953), pp. 164-171, 175.

[8]DeVane, *Handbook,* p. 229.

[9]*Complete Poetical Works* (Cambridge Edition; Boston, 1895), p. 193. All quotations from Browning are from this edition.

[10]DeVane, *Handbook,* p. 229.

[11]See DeVane, *Handbook,* for instance, on "The Flight of the Duchess": "life and literature are indistinguishably mingled here"—p. 175.

[12]Lionel Stevenson makes a point which is quite meaningful to this study. In the use of the Malory source, Browning substituted Roland in the matter of France for Gareth in the matter of Britain—"The Pertinacious Victorian Poets," in *Victorian Literature: Modern Essays in Criticism,* p. 24.

[13]The 3rd edition of Volume I of Ruskin's *Modern Painters* was issued on September 16, 1846, the year of Browning's marriage; see *Works of John Ruskin,* ed. E. T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn (Library edition; 39 vols.; London, 1903-1912), III, lviii. The 1st edition of Volume II was issued on April 24, 1846 (*Works,* IV, liii). The Cook and Wedderburn edition is cited throughout the paper.

[14]*Letters of Elizabeth Barrett Browning,* ed. by G. F. Kenyon (2 vols.; London, 1897), I, 384. The evidence furnished in this letter is somewhat equivocal: "Robert could agree with him only by snatches." Which snatches she referred to would reveal much. Disagreement with a specific Ruskinian eccentricity may have colored the tone of the statement. Both husband and wife, "standing before a very expressive picture of Domenichino's (the 'David'—at Fano) wondered how he could blaspheme so against a great artist." One is inclined to discount such a clash as a disagreement between devotees over a minor point. Robert "knows a good deal about art," his wife wrote here; Ruskin, unnamed and referred to in the letter merely as an "Oxford student," was a newcomer to the field. Furthermore, Ruskin's statements read in 1848 might by 1851 have taken on a new and deeper perspective for Browning after his rather tense period in England.

[15]*Works,* III, 147.

[16]*Ibid.,* p. 142.

[17]*Ibid.,* pp. 626-627.

[18]Persuasive evidence is in W. C. DeVane, *Browning's Parleyings* (New Haven, 1927), pp. 228-229.

[19]Miller, p. 178.

[20]According to L. N. Broughton and B. F. Stelter, *A Concordance to the Poems of Robert Browning* (New York, 1924), I, 99.

[21]DeVane, *Handbook,* p. 231.

Drummond of Hawthornden and the Divine Right of Kings

Charles L. Hamilton

In comparing William Drummond of Hawthornden with Montrose, David Masson implies that the two Scots held similar ideas concerning the origins of political obligation. Drummond is described as a theoretical Montrose—a scholarly counterpart of the incredible Scottish paladin.[1] On the surface, there is little justification for Masson's view. Drummond was an adherent of the intellectually fashionable doctrine of the divine right of kings. Montrose, as John Buchan reminds us, believed in the existence of higher laws which limited the exercise of political power.[2] To Montrose the constitution of a country placed the sovereign power in the hands of one agent—in England and Scotland the king—who could be legally resisted if this was necessary to prevent the growth of tyranny. Thus Montrose fought with distinction for the Scottish Covenanters in the Bishops' Wars (1639-40) against Charles I. He became a royalist only when, in his opinion, the extreme Covenanters began to attack the legal powers of the King in Scotland in order to supplant the more apparent than real absolutism of the Stuarts with what promised to be an extremely efficient dictatorship of the Marquis of Argyll aided by the disciplinary machinery of the Scottish Kirk.

Montrose's views on politics, therefore, bound him to no form of government, whereas Drummond's theories compelled him to argue that monarchy was instituted by God and that the duty of the subject was complete obedience to the divinely appointed king.[3] Yet Drummond shied away from equating divine right with royal absolutism and, by his hesitancy, is less at odds with Montrose than might appear.

One factor which violated the logical simplicity of Drummond's political theory was his own sense of justice. During the meeting of the Scottish Parliament of 1633, a group of those who opposed Charles I's religious policy drew up a petition or supplication which they intended to present to the King. Despite the fact that the petition was never formally submitted to Charles, the crown instituted legal proceedings against one of the men associated with the protestation, John Elphinstone, Lord Balmerino, and he was duly tried and convicted of treason. Although he was spared the death penalty and ultimately pardoned, Balmerino was imprisoned for a time and his treatment by the King attracted considerable notice in Scotland, for his stand against the growing Arminian element in the Church of Scotland was relatively popular. Just prior to Balmerino's trial, Drummond wrote a paper dealing with the affair.[4] He argued that subjects had the right to petition the King, even on matters in which they disagreed with the sovereign. Furthermore, Drummond implied that some of the King's policies in Scotland—or those administered in his name—were actually oppressive and that the King would do well to heed those who were simply trying to tell him of his duty. It was at this time that Drummond made his pointed suggestion to Charles that he should read George Buchanan's *De Jure Regni apud Scotos,* a work in which the famous Renaissance Latinist had argued that political authority was derived from the consent of the governed.

An even more forceful argument for limiting the king's power, so Drummond argued, was expediency. In the Balmerino affair he warned Charles against making martyrs of every one who talked or wrote against his regime. The same idea, that on occasions the prudent king places self-imposed restrictions on his legally unlimited powers, appears in *Irene,* Drummond's most famous political work. Written in response to a proclamation of the King issued on September 22, 1638, in which Charles agreed to many of the Covenanters' demands in Scotland, *Irene* praised the King's action, for Drummond believed it would bring peace. Again, toward the end of the work,

Drummond urged the King to show mercy to those who had openly defied royal authority in Scotland. After all, some of the royal policies were unwise and some of the actions of the King's servants were censurable. In these circumstances a wise prince would curb his powers and show mercy in order to regain the love of his subjects and to avoid civil strife.[5]

Conversely, Drummond used expediency as an argument for encouraging subjects to obey their prince. If opposition to a monarch brought on civil war, who gained? In *Irene,* Drummond reminded his readers of the tragic state of Germany.[6] On another occasion, when discussing the struggle between the King and the Covenanters in Scotland over religious questions, he asked whether episcopacy, which lay at the heart of Charles' policy, was to be dreaded more than the civil war which the opposition of the Covenanters was certain to bring.[7] Again in *Irene,* Drummond warned the opponents of the King in Scotland that their struggle against Charles would breed social anarchy.[8] Keeping in mind the conservative Covenanting leaders, he stated that to challenge the prince's authority would encourage servants to question their masters, wives their husbands, and children their parents. It was not only unjust, but foolhardy, for the Scottish nobility, whose position the monarchy helped to sustain, to question the authority of the King.

In his now classical discussion of the divine right of kings, John Neville Figgis argued that the divine right theory was often used to counter the claims of other institutions to absolute obedience, in particular to oppose the claims of the clergy—either Protestant or Roman Catholic—to supremacy over the monarchy.[9] This seems to be true of Drummond. During the years in which he wrote his most important works on political theory, Drummond lived in a country in which the clergy successfully exercised a great deal of power for political and moral coercion. Politicians who crossed swords with the Kirk and its political allies, as Montrose did, brought down on themselves the fury of the preachers and the official excommunication of the

Church. An example of the Kirk's interference in political affairs occurred in January, 1643, when the Commissioners of the General Assembly, an executive body which acted in the name of the Church from one General Assembly to the next, condemned a petition drawn up by the Duke of Hamilton urging Scotland to come to the aid of Charles I, then embroiled in civil war in England. Hamilton and his adherents claimed that Scotland had sworn to uphold Charles in the National Covenant of 1638. In answer to Hamilton, the Kirk commissioners issued a petition which attacked Hamilton's action and which indicated that the loyalty of Hamilton and his associates to the Covenant was doubtful. Furthermore, the Commissioners required every minister to read their petition from the pulpit. Even some of the clergy protested against the Commissioners' action, stating that they had no warrant for compelling uniformity on political matters.[10] For Drummond the action of the Commissioners was a supreme act of clerical arrogance, and in *Skiamachia* he reviled the Scottish clergy, comparing their actions with those of the Inquisition in Spain.[11] Masson, in commenting on Drummond's outbust, writes that he had become "universally and indiscriminately, a clergy-hater."[12]

If Drummond's fierce anti-clericalism was the basis for his theory of divine right of kings, then he is not really inconsistent in limiting the sovereign's limitless power. To counter the claims of priest or presbyter to complete obedience, Drummond exalted the king, but as the prince would often undermine his position by exercising his full powers, the Laird of Hawthornden advised him to act with prudence toward his subjects, listening to those who respectfully opposed him and tempering justice with clemency in dealing with those who actively rebelled against him.

FOOTNOTES

[1]*Drummond of Hawthornden* (London, 1873), p. 346.

[2]See Buchan's *Montrose* (London, n.d.), pp. 137-140 and p. 140n.

[3]For an exposition of this idea, see *Irene* in *The Works of William Drummond*

of Hawthornden (Edinburgh, 1711), pp. 163ff.

[4]*An Apologetical Letter* (March 2, 1635) in *Works,* p. 133f.

[5]His plea to Charles to show clemency is contained in the final section of *Irene, Works,* pp. 172-173. Masson refers to this as the doctrine of "unenforced command"; *op. cit.,* p. 285. Drummond's admiration for kings who restrain the exercise of their power appears in his discussion of James I of Scotland's lenient policy toward those who rebelled against him; *The History of the Lives and Reigns of the Five James's, Kings of Scotland . . . , Works,* p. 5.

[6]*Works,* p. 165.

[7]*Queries of State, Works,* p. 177.

[8]*Works,* p. 166.

[9]John Neville Figgis, *The Divine Right of Kings* (2d ed.; Cambridge, 1934), p. 282. Figgis argued that the essential characteristic of the divine right theory was not absolutism, although this was implied, but the "assertion of the inherent right of the civil as against the ecclesiastical authority. James II tried or was thought to be trying to use the absolutist theory in order to restore the very power, that of the Pope, against which . . . [the divine right theory] had been forged."

[10]For example, see the letter of the Presbytery of Stirling to Robert Douglas, a minister in Edinburgh and a leading Commissioner of the General Assembly, Wodrow MSS., folio vol. XXV, no. 11, Library of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, Edinburgh.

[11]*Skiamachia, Works,* pp. 191-205. Drummond inquired: "Have we rejected the High Commission to get over us men more rigid, supercilious and severe, than the Spanish Inquisitions themselves?"

[12]*Op. cit.,* p. 374. In 1648, Robert Baillie, one of the leading Covenanting divines, was also to question the desirability of the Kirk intervening in civil affairs. "I am more and more in the mind, that it were for the good of the world, that Churchmen did meddle with Ecclesiastic affairs only; that were they never so able otherwise, they are unhappy statesmen; that as Erastian Caesaro-Papism is hurtful to the Church, so an Episcopal Papa-Caesarism is unfortunate for the State"; *The Letters and Journals of Robert Baillie,* ed. David Laing (Edinburgh, 1842), III, 38.

The Genesis of *Mr. Isaacs*

John Pilkington, Jr.

In 1881, when F. Marion Crawford came to this country after receiving an education in Italy, Germany, and England and editing an Anglo-Indian newspaper in India, he had no idea that he would soon write a novel.[1] A little more than a year later, he had written *Mr. Isaacs: A Tale of Modern India* (1882),[2] thereby beginning a career which would lead him to the publication of almost fifty novels and a measure of lasting fame as the most consistently popular fiction writer of his day. The circumstances which led to the writing and publication of his first novel do not indicate that he was a born novelist, but they do provide a valuable commentary upon the initial phases of what was to prove a remarkably successful literary career.

Two possible sources for the initial idea of the story of *Mr. Isaacs* have been suggested by Mrs. Maud Howe Elliott in *My Cousin, F. Marion Crawford.* Since she wrote her book, additional information has become available that helps to correct and elaborate her statements. As the basis of her most extensive account of the inception of *Mr. Isaacs,* Mrs. Elliott relies upon the memory of George Brett who in 1882 was employed in the retail store of the Macmillan Publishing Company; in later years he was to be president of the company and one of Crawford's most intimate friends. Mrs. Elliott quotes Brett as saying:

> Mr. Ward [Sam Ward, Crawford's uncle], Crawford and I dined together at the Brevoort House [in New York], and at that time Crawford told us the story of Mr. Jacobs [to be Isaacs in the novel]. Crawford was greatly disturbed because he did not know what to do, had failed in several

> things, singing in the opera, teaching Sanskrit, carrying on of the Indian paper. There was a discussion as to what Crawford should do. I said, "There is no question what you should do,—write out that story."[3]

That Mrs. Elliott was not entirely certain about the accuracy of Brett's recollections is evident from her comment that "Uncle Sam [Ward] always claimed the credit of having advised Marion [Crawford] to write the book about Mr. Jacobs, the diamond merchant at Simla."[4] But she continues, "One thing is certain—Marion's destiny was fixed that night when he, Uncle Sam and the young Brett, now the head of The Macmillan Company, dined together at the old Brevoort House, at Fifth Avenue and Eighth Street."[5]

Brett voiced his recollections of the occasion to Mrs. Elliott as she was writing her book about Crawford. A much earlier account of the affair was given by Crawford himself to Robert Bridges in an interview published in *McClure's Magazine* in 1895. According to Bridges, Crawford said that " 'this is exactly how it happened' ":

> On May 5, 1882, Uncle Sam asked me to dine with him at the New York Club, which was then in the building on Madison Square now called the Madison Square Bank building. It goes without saying that we had a good dinner if it was ordered by Uncle Sam. We had dined rather early, and were sitting in the smoking-room, overlooking Madison Square, while it was still light. As was perfectly natural we began to exchange stories while smoking, and I told him, with a great deal of detail, my recollections of an interesting man whom I had met in Simla. When I finished he said to me, "That is a good two-part magazine story, and you must write it out immediately." He took me around to his

> apartments, and that night I began to write the story of "Mr. Isaacs."[6]

There is considerable difference between Brett's account and Crawford's version. Crawford places the dinner at the New York Club located on the corner of Madison Avenue and Twenty-third Street in Madison Square. Brett recalls the dinner as having taken place at the Brevoort House at Fifth Avenue and Eighth Street. Crawford implies that only he and Sam Ward were persent; whereas Brett notes that all three men participated in the conversation. For the reason to be noted below, the identity of the man who originated the plan is perhaps not of vital significance; Crawford's version, nevertheless, seems the more accurate one, because his statement is closer in point of time to the actual event and because he should have known the facts. His comment, moreover, is fully substantiated by a letter which he wrote to Sam Ward on August 22, 1882, about a month after the novel was completed. Crawford wrote: "I hope you will never forget that but for your suggestion Isaacs would never have been written and that I owe it therefore to you, as I do so many other things."[7] One must remember that Brett was recalling events which had happened almost fifty years earlier and that there were a great many dinner parties which included the three men. The Brevoort House was a favorite eating place for the gourmet-minded Sam Ward; and it is quite likely that Crawford told the story more than once. Brett may have made his suggestion independently of Sam Ward. Crawford, however, gave the full credit to his uncle.

Crawford himself in recalling the circumstances surrounding the inception of *Mr. Isaacs* may have made an error, or Bridges may have quoted him incorrectly. In Bridges' quotation, Crawford said that he began the novel on May 5, 1882. This date is an obvious error, because on April 27, 1882, Crawford wrote to Sam Ward from Boston as follows: "I am at work on the story [of Mr. Isaacs] . . . ."[8] A letter from Sam Ward to Julia Ward Howe, dated Good Friday (April 7), 1882, New York, reveals that Crawford had been working in Sam

Ward's apartment on several articles for the *North American Review*.[9] Since Sam Ward makes no mention of a work of fiction, very probably Crawford had either not begun it or had made very little progress with it. There are no extant letters mentioning Crawford from this time until April 27 by which date he had evidently been in Boston for some time. The best inference is that Crawford began to write his story during the early part of April. If Bridges wrote *May 5* by mistake for *April 5,* Crawford's version of the beginning of his fictional writing could be considered accurate in every respect.

From the evidence it seems clear that through Sam Ward's influence Crawford began to write in New York a magazine story based upon his experience in India. The venture conforms to the pattern of his other activities. Ever since Crawford's arrival in this country on February 14, 1881, Sam Ward had been endeavoring to help his nephew to find a suitable vocation. As Brett's recollections would suggest, Crawford had considered a number of possible openings, but he had not settled upon any one. He had abandoned teaching, singing, and politics. Most of his attempts had been outgrowths of his experiences in India, and by far the most successful had been his efforts to write, for which his work as editor of the *Indian Herald* had trained him. Sam Ward had introduced him to the editors of the most important New York newspapers for whom Crawford had written several articles; and Sam Ward had brought his nephew to the attention of several magazine editors, notably Richard Watson Gilder of the *Century Magazine* and Jeanette Gilder of the *Critic*. For the periodicals they represented Crawford had reviewed a considerable number of books dealing with India.[10] In the context of his other activities, the suggestion on the part of either Sam Ward or George Brett that Crawford write a story about an incident which happened to him in India is not in the least surprising.

What was new in the suggestion, however, was that Crawford turn to fiction; heretofore he had written editorials, news-stories, essays, and reviews, but no fiction. He made the transition in what was

probably the easiest manner for him by narrating the story in the first person, using the fictional name of Paul Griggs. About this matter, there is certain evidence. A year after he published the novel, he wrote in a letter to A. Bence Jones: "I am the real Paul Griggs of the story . . . and the occasional allusions to my own history are for the most part true."[11] That *Mr. Isaacs* was a personal and at times autobiographical novel can scarcely be questioned.

At what point the "two-part magazine story" became a novel, however, cannot be precisely determined. Talking to Bridges in 1895, Crawford recalled that "part of the first chapter was written afterwards [that is, after he began to write in Sam Ward's apartment], but the rest of the chapter and several succeeding chapters are the story I told to Uncle Sam. I kept at it from day to day, getting more interested in the work as I proceeded . . . ."[12] Since the chapters mentioned by Crawford deal principally with Paul Griggs' first meeting with Mr. Isaacs, the fabulously wealthy jewel merchant, and with the incidents of Mr. Isaacs' life prior to the opening of the events which take place subsequent to this meeting, one concludes that they represent the original story related to Sam Ward. By April 27, 1882, Crawford had made considerable progress, for on that date he wrote Sam Ward from Boston:

> I am at work on the story—the character and personality of Jacobs [Isaacs] are a romance in themselves, *s'il en fut.* It is easy to make him fall in love with some fair English girl and to lead them through numberless adventures—weaving in stories of Nicoletts which I believe I told you—not to mention personal experiences in India."[13]

The inference is clear that Crawford began with the intention of featuring his first encounter with Mr. Isaacs—including an account of Mr. Isaacs' career up to that point—but as Crawford wrote, the possibilities of continuing Mr. Isaacs' adventures became so evident that Crawford continued to write. At some time he must have realized

that he had already reached a point beyond the limits of a "two-part magazine story." For this reason, he was forced to make additions to what he had already written. In all probability by April 27, he knew he was actually writing a novel.

Further light on the composition of *Mr. Isaacs* is afforded by Crawford's correspondence with Mrs. Isabella Stewart Gardner. In a letter to her apparently written from New York, Crawford talks about his method of writing. After discussing a chapter that had caused him "trouble and vexation of spirit," Crawford continues:

> I shall not look at it again for a week—not until I read it to you—and then I may improve it. The people all say what I think they would, but they are *repeating parts*—there is not enough life in them. They ought to have more individuality and less Lindley Murray and syntax. I have made Isaacs tell his story, of course without my repeating any of it, and I have created a slight embarrassment for Miss Westonhaugh, and a little argumentative tiff, and I wound up putting Ghyrkins in a rage with Kildare's ideas about tigers. The latter, who is as brave as [a] terrier, has never seen a tiger, and talks wildly about them for the sake of egging Ghyrkins on. G[hyrkins]. at last vows that K[ildare]. shall see a live man eater before the week is out. Isaacs steals out to Miss W[estonhaugh]. while we are smoking, and I keep the men over their cigars as long as I can. So we break up[.] Tomorrow we have the polo, in the eighth chapter.[14]

This letter is convincing, for by using the pronoun *I* instead of the name Paul Griggs, Crawford clearly reveals that he has personally entered his novel as a character. Paul Griggs emerges in the novel

not only as the teller of the story but also as the literal representative of the author.

Since the passage in the novel dealing with Paul Griggs' efforts to detain the men over their cigars at the dinner party occurs at the end of chapter seven, Crawford was approximately half-finished with the work when he wrote the undated letter to Mrs. Gardner. Ahead of him were the episodes of the polo match, the tiger hunt, the liberation of Shere Ali, and the final scenes about the death of his heroine, Katharine Westonhaugh. Crawford had gone to New York on May 2 to visit his uncle, and by May 18 he was still in New York. A good guess as to the date of the letter to Mrs. Gardner would be shortly before May 18. He was evidently consulting Sam Ward about the development of the story, since in the letter to Mrs. Gardner he comments that "U[ncle]. S[am]. says I improve as I go and he likes the dinner party chapt[er]."[15] Very probably he discussed with Sam Ward the final episodes of the work before returning to Boston. He had promised his cousin, Julia Anagnos, to visit her for ten days beginning June 1, and the tenor of his letter to Sam Ward, written from her home in South Boston on June 11, suggests that he has been there for some time. Crawford writes:

> I have not written yet because I have been busy and have had nothing special of interest to tell you. . . .
>
> Isaacs is practically finished. I have still a few final touches to put which are not a question of time, but of careful deliberation and when decided will not occupy more than an hour. Both Mrs. Gardner and Julia Anagnos cried vigorously over the death of the heroine, and were much excited in the scene when Shere Ali is liberated.[16]

Crawford had not written Sam Ward since he arrived in Boston; yet since he expected his uncle to know about the scenes at the end

of the novel, he must have either written a draft of the ending or at least discussed it thoroughly with Sam Ward before leaving New York.

Crawford's correspondence during April, May, and June, 1882, proves conclusively that he was very much indebted to Sam Ward and to Mrs. Gardner for their help and advice in the writing of *Mr. Isaacs*. In describing the composition of the novel to Bridges, Crawford mentions reading chapters "from time to time . . . to Uncle Sam,"[17] but there is no reference to Mrs. Gardner. Yet his letters written during the actual time of writing the novel indicate that he sought her advice. In the undated letter to her already quoted, he concludes his discussion of the polo match in the eighth chapter by saying, "The last is so long that I think seriously of cutting it in two, but I will consult you about it before I make any change." And he adds, "You must be getting tired of my eternal talk about Isaacs." In another letter written to Mrs. Gardner, probably early in December, 1882, about the time he produced his second novel, he referred to *Mr. Isaacs* and to her part in its composition by saying, "I cannot realize that Isaacs is now before the world—it is a thing of the past to me, and I think of it as someone else's work—as indeed it is, love, for without you I should never have written it."[18] Although Mrs. Gardner's influence cannot be pin-pointed, it is clear that she provided not only practical advice about plot and character interpretation but also the encouragement and stimulus for writing that Crawford very much needed during the time he was composing his novel.

The nature of Sam Ward's contribution has already been indicated. He not only suggested the possibility of making a story out of Crawford's experiences, but also worked directly with Crawford in realizing them in fiction. The extent of his hand in the novel can perhaps be best indicated by Crawford's remark in a letter to his uncle written on June 15, 1882, the date on which Crawford finished the novel. Crawford wrote: "Isaacs is entirely finished and

ready, if you will let me know what to do with it—whether to send it by express or to keep it until I come."[19] It was Sam Ward who made the arrangements to send the manuscript to the London office of the Macmillan Company, and it was Sam Ward who on August 21 telegraphed the good news from New York to Crawford in Boston: "MacMillan [*sic*] accepts isaacs [*sic*] and I have authorized him to put it immediately in hand. Terms ten percent of retail sales."[20] Crawford's first novel was a reality, and he was successfully launched as a novelist. In Mrs. Elliott's words, "Marion's destiny was fixed."

George Brett was correct in his recollections of Crawford's efforts to find a congenial vocation. In 1882 Crawford was a young man in his late twenties possessing a great deal of talent and for a person of his age an astonishing variety of experiences. His problem was to find the means to channel both ability and training into a field which would be attractive and at the same time financially rewarding. Sam Ward, who recognized that his nephew's most probable chances of success lay in writing, suggested that he write a fictional story based upon his actual experiences and thereby, perhaps unwittingly, started Crawford on a career as a novelist.

Crawford did not begin to write *Mr. Isaacs* as a novel; instead he began a short story. When he had completed the story that had prompted Sam Ward to suggest the venture, Crawford "kept on writing, to see what would happen."[21] What happened was a novel plotted around a succession of episodes which Crawford realized would necessitate revisions and additions to the initial part. Perhaps the central feature of his method of composition was his identification of one of the characters of the novel with himself. In subsequent novels Crawford was to follow this practice repeatedly, sometimes using the name of Paul Griggs and at other times projecting himself as some other character. As he continued to write, he learned the necessity of deciding upon the complete plot of a work before he began to write, but the autobiographical content of his writing continued to be a significant ingredient of his fiction.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Research for this article has been made possible partially through a grant from the faculty committee on research of the University of Mississippi. Quotations from the letters of Francis Marion Crawford to Mrs. Isabella Stewart Gardner and to A. Bence Jones have been made with the permission of the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, Massachusetts. Quotations from the letters of Francis Marion Crawford to Samuel Ward and from the letters of Samuel Ward to Mrs. Julia Ward Howe have been made with the permission of the Houghton Library of Harvard University.

[2]The story, which is narrated by Paul Griggs, editor of an Anglo-Indian newspaper, deals with the adventures of Abdul Hafizben-Isak, a wealthy jewel merchant, who generally uses the name of "Mr. Isaacs." After their first meeting in a hotel in Simla, the two men become close friends. Griggs helps Mr. Isaacs to win the love of Katharine Westonhaugh, an English girl, and to liberate Shere Ali, an Indian leader in revolt against British rule. The plot is sustained through a number of incidents, including a polo match, a tiger hunt, and a desperate fight in a mountain pass. Near the end of the novel, Miss Westonhaugh dies of jungle fever; and Mr. Isaacs is last seen as he accepts the life of a religious.

[3]Maud Howe Elliott, *My Cousin, F. Marion Crawford* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934), p. 127.

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 128. Samuel Ward, the brother of Crawford's mother (Louisa Cutler Ward Crawford), had had an amazing career. Born in 1814, he was a child prodigy in mathematics. After graduation from Columbia at the age of seventeen, he studied mathematics abroad but soon lost interest in the subject. He returned to New York, worked for a time in his father's bank, and then became a prospector in the California gold rush of 1849. Within a few years he had abandoned the search for gold in California and become one of the first lobbyists in Washington. Meanwhile he had married twice; his first wife was the grand-daughter of John Jacob Astor and his second a celebrated beauty of New York society. By 1880, however, he was living by himself, nationally known as "Uncle Sam," and as good an example of a "universal genius" as nineteenth-century America produced. While his left hand was lobbying for magnates of big business, his right was busy in literary criticism, authorship, art collecting, and an endless round of dinner parties. He knew and charmed almost every celebrity of the time; he lived by his charm. Perhaps no other person in the United States was then better qualified to help a young man to a successful career.

[5]*Ibid.*

[6]Robert Bridges, "F. Marion Crawford: A Conversation," *McClure's Magazine*, IV (March, 1895), 320.

[7]Letter to Samuel Ward, August 22, 1882, in the Houghton Library of Harvard University.

[8]Letter to Samuel Ward, April 27, 1882, in the Houghton Library of Harvard University.

[9]Letter from Samuel Ward to Julia Ward Howe, April 7, 1882, in the Houghton Library of Harvard University.

[10]Among these reviews were such books as Arthur Lillie's *Buddha and Early*

Buddhism, John Owen's *Evenings with the Skeptics,* T. W. Rhys Davids' *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion,* Thomas W. Knox's *The Boy Travellers in the Far East,* Major George A. Jacob's *A Manual of Hindu Pantheism,* and A. Barth's *The Religions of India.*

[11]Letter to A. Bence Jones, February 7, 1883, in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, Massachusetts.

[12]Bridges, "F. Marion Crawford: A Conversation," p. 320.

[13]Letter to Samuel Ward, April 27, 1882, in the Houghton Library of Harvard University.

[14]Letter to Mrs. Isabella Stewart Gardner, date missing, in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, Massachusetts; the italics are Crawford's. Later in the same letter, Crawford remarks: "This evening I do not know when I shall dine, but I shall write afterwards as much as I can of the polo match. Thank heaven, I am not tired yet, and I think I may carry it through. A polo game is a bright, easy thing to describe—all hoofs and clubs and galloping. It is much easier to describe an earthquake than a tea party—there is so much more of it."

[15]*Ibid.*

[16]Letter to Samuel Ward, June 11, 1882, in the Houghton Library of Harvard University. The record is very clear that Crawford wrote a considerable portion of the novel in New York and actually finished it at his cousin's house in South Boston. Mrs. Louise Hall Tharp has written that "it was Aunt Julia [Ward Howe] who ordered her nephew F. Marion to sit down at a table in her little garden in Newport and write at least eight hours a day until his novel was done"—*Three Saints and a Sinner: Julia Ward Howe, Louisa, Annie and Sam Ward* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1956), p. 281. Mrs. Tharp does not reveal the source for her statement; but if Mrs. Howe issued the order, Crawford did not obey. It is true, however, that a part of the novel was written at her house.

[17]Bridges, "F. Marion Crawford: A Conversation," p. 320.

[18]Letter to Mrs. Isabella Stewart Gardner, date missing, in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, Massachusetts.

[19]Letter to Samuel Ward, June 15, 1882, in the Houghton Library of Harvard University.

[20]Telegram, August 21, 1882, in the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, Massachusetts; *Mr. Isaacs* was published by Macmillan, December 5, 1882.

[21]Bridges, "F. Marion Crawford: A Conversation," p. 320.

The Matron of Ephesus Again: An Analysis

Allen Cabaniss

Christopher Fry was "discovered" in 1946 with his comedy, *A Phoenix Too Frequent*. Since that time the play has gone through no less than nine printings, the latest being in 1959, indicating a degree of interest and popularity. Fry states on one of the earlier pages of his book that "The story was got from Jeremy Taylor who had it from Petronius." On turning back to the good bishop we find a version of the story near the very end of his *Holy Living and Dying*, correctly attributed to Petronius.[1] It would appear that Fry knew only the version in Taylor and nothing directly from the one in Petronius, for he follows the former in describing the mode of execution as hanging, not crucifixion as in the latter.

The incident, commonly called "the matron of Ephesus" or "the faithless widow" story, has had an extensive history, both in Latin and in the vernaculars. Far better than the somewhat romanticized account of Bishop Taylor is the one which appears in the writings of another Englishman, indeed of another prelate, John of Salisbury, bishop of Chartres. In Book VIII of his *Policraticus* he related the tale from Petronius almost *verbatim*, following it with the statement that for whatever it was worth Flavian vouched for the historicity of the incident.[2]

The story has attracted much scholarly, as well as popular, attention and inevitably the search for sources and analogues has been persistent.[3] As far as is certainly known, it first appeared in the writings credited to Phaedrus (ca. 15 B.C.—ca. A.D. 50),[4] but the most familiar version is obviously the one by Petronius (ca. A.D.

19—ca. 66), embedded in his inimitable *Satiricon*.[5] And it has been generally assumed that the latter derived it from the former. That may indeed be true, but it is equally possible, if the event described were an actual occurrence, that Phaedrus and Petronius were both independently giving literary form to a notorious incident.

In order to have the data before us, both stories are here presented in translation as literal as English idiom will permit. First, Phaedrus:

> Not many years ago a certain woman lost a beloved husband and laid his body in a tomb. Since she could not be torn away from it, but was determined to spend her life mourning in the sepulcher, she gained the illustrious reputation of a chaste virgin.
>
> In the meanwhile men who had pillaged a temple of Jupiter had paid the penalties to the divine majesty by suffering crucifixion. That no one could take away their remains, soldiers are furnished as guards of the corpses close by the tomb where the woman had confined herself.
>
> On this occasion one of the guards, becoming thirsty, asked water of a young slave girl at midnight. She was, it happens, attending her mistress who was then preparing to go to sleep, for she had worked at night and had prolonged her vigils until a late hour.
>
> Since the gates were opened a little, the soldier peers in and sees an extraordinary woman of beautiful face. His heart, instantly arrested, is enkindled and a passion of uncontrollable emotion consumes him. Adroit keenness finds a thousand reasons by which he might see her more often. Overcome by the daily habit, she is little by little made more submissive to the stranger, and soon a closer tie has bound her heart.
>
> While the attentive guard passes the night here, a body was stolen from one cross. The troubled soldier revealed the deed to the woman. But the holy virgin says, "It is not

what you fear," and she hands over her husband's body to be affixed to the cross, that the soldier may not undergo the penalties of negligence.

Thus shame took the place of praise.

The following is the account offered by Petronius:

A certain matron of Ephesus was of such notable virtue that she stirred the women of the neighboring communities for a sight of her. When therefore this woman was bearing her husband to the grave, she was not content in common fashion to follow the funeral procession with hair disheveled or to beat her naked breast before the eyes of the multitude. She indeed followed the deceased into the sepulcher and began to guard the body (which was placed in an underground crypt of Greek style) and to lament day and night. Injuring herself in this manner and striving for death by abstinence from food, neither parents nor kinsmen could entice her away. At length even the rebuffed magistrates withdrew.

The woman, a unique paragon, mourned by everyone, was already dragging out her fifth day without nourishment. Beside the ailing woman her very devoted maid-servant was sitting, adding her tears to the grieving woman and renewing the light placed in the tomb whenever it went out. Throughout the entire city there was one tale. Men of every rank were avowing that this alone shone brilliantly as a true example of virtue and love.

In the meanwhile the governor of the province ordered robbers to be crucified near that little dwelling where the matron was bewailing the fresh corpse. On the next night when the soldier, who was guarding the crosses so that no one might take the bodies down for burial, observed a light shining very brightly among the tombs and heard the groaning of weeping women, he longed, with the bad habit of hu-

mankind, to know who or what was doing that. He therefore went down into the sepulcher, but when he had observed such a beautiful woman he stopped immediately, confused as though by a certain apparition, as by phantoms of the lower regions.

As soon, however, as he saw the body of the dead one and reflected upon the tears and the face scratched by fingernails, he realized what it was, namely, that the woman could not bear her grief for the dead man. He brought to the tomb his own little supper and undertook to urge the mourning one not to persist in useless sorrowing or to break her heart with unavailing sigh, "for there is the same last home and dwelling place for all men," and other sentiments with which embittered minds are summoned back to right reason. But ignoring the consolation, she beat and lacerated her breast more violently and, tearing out her tresses, laid them on the dead man's breast.

The soldier, however, did not leave but strove with the same urgency to give the young woman food, until the maidservant, enticed by the odor of wine offered by him, finally stretched out a vanquished hand to the kindly allurer. Thereupon, refreshed by drink and food, she began to attack her mistress's persistence and says, "What will it profit you[6] if you are weakened by fasting, if you have buried yourself alive, if you have poured out a spirit uncondemned before the Fates demand? 'Do you believe that ashes and the buried shades feel this?' [Vergil, *Aeneid,* iv. 34]

"Do you want to come to life again? Feminine uncertainty thrown aside, do you want to enjoy the advantages of light as long as is shall be permitted? That very body of the dead man ought to warn you to live?"

No one listens unwillingly when he is exhorted to take food and live. Consequently, the woman, wasted with sev-

eral days' abstinence, suffered her resolution to be shattered and filled herself with food no less greedily than the maid who had been overcome earlier. For the rest, you know what commonly tempts a full human being. With the same blandishments with which the soldier had persuaded the matron to want to live, he now made advances on her virtue. To the chaste woman indeed he seemed a handsome and eloquent young man, with the maid pleading his cause and frequently reciting: "Will you fight against a pleasing love? Has it not entered your mind in whose ploughed lands you will station yourself?" [Vergil, *Aeneid,* iv 38f]

Why do I delay any further? The woman did not long withhold that part of her body and the triumphant soldier was doubly convincing. They slept together not only that one night in which they consummated the union but also the next day and the third day, of course with the doors of the sepulcher closed tightly so that if anyone known to them or a stranger had come to the tomb he would have thought that the very virtuous wife had perished over her husband's body.

The soldier, charmed by the woman's comeliness and by the secrecy, purchased whatever provisions he could with his means and brought them at nightfall to the tomb. And so it was that the parents of one of the crucified victims, when they perceived that custody was relaxed, took down their hanging son one night and buried him with the final rites.

When the outwitted soldier was resuming his place on the next day, he saw one cross without a corpse. Terrified he told the woman what punishment would befall him, and further that he would not await the magistrate's sentence but would himself pronounce judgment upon his slothfulness with his own sword. Would she grant him a place when he was dead and provide the fatal sepulcher for lover as well as for husband?

> The woman, no less merciful than virtuous, replies: "The gods grant that I may not at the same time witness the funeral of the two men dearest to me. I would rather hang the dead than kill the living." In accordance with this utterance she orders the body of her husband to be taken from the casket and to be nailed to the cross which was empty. The soldier accomplished the scheme of the very clever woman and on the next day the people wondered how a dead man had mounted the cross.

In spite of differences to be noted, it is quite obvious that Phaedrus and Petronius are telling the same story with the same three players, the matron, her maid, and the soldier. The devotion of the woman to her deceased husband is emphasized and her reputation for virtue is set forth. The vain attempt of the citizenry to dissuade her from dwelling in or near the tomb of her husband is a subject of both authors, and they agree about her beauty as well as her virtue. Both recount the crucifixions near the sepulcher and the need for guards. Both confirm her seduction by the soldier at nighttime and both relate the theft of a body from one of the crosses, as well as the woman's offer of her late husband's body as a substitute to save the guard from punishment.

There are, it is true, some ambiguities within both narratives. In Phaedrus's version a band of soldiers was set to guard the executed criminals. Apart from that brief statement, however, only one soldier was involved in the tale. If several had been present, surely they would have worked in shifts of two or more, and the absence of one would not have left the place unguarded. But Phaedrus conveniently ignores his minor inconsistency, for otherwise he would have had no story at all. Petronius wisely mentions one guard only and thus avoids the difficulty. It is likely that Phaedrus's unwitting reference to a plurality of soldiers more accurately reflects actual practice on such occasions, but Petronius's method, though less credible historically, is certainly the more artistic. His employment of a single guard renders

his version practically impossible as an actual occurrence, while Phaedrus's casual reference, suggesting as it does what was probably customary, makes his story artistically impossible. The obvious inference is that such a story never really happened, but that it was fabricated out of whole cloth merely for entertainment. Or, alternatively, that it did happen, but only once, uniquely, and thus became a *cause celebre.*

The other ambiguity belongs to Petronius as the one above to Phaedrus. Both authors stress the beauty of the widow in superlative terms and Phaedrus never suggests any change. Petronius, however, goes on to describe her as following the cortege with disheveled hair and breasts exposed to view. Five days later, wasted with fasting, she was a woman with face tear-streaked and torn by fingernails, her breast violently lacerated, and large patches of her hair torn out by the roots. It seems curiously contradictory to state that a woman of such appearance was still beautiful. But Petronius was not troubled. In the nature of things his romance required a beautiful woman, so he ignored his ambiguity. It appears that Phaedrus's version is the more credible although less true to reality, while Petronius's account is artistically the better, although not likely to have been factually true. As in the instance of the ambiguity in Phaedrus, this Petronian one leads to the inference that the story is contrived, not based on any known actual happening, although in this later case there is a definite statement by the narrator, Eumolpus, that it "occurred within his own memory,"[7] a commonplace among story-tellers which inspires no confidence in its historical veracity. Or which indeed may mean no more than that he had read or heard the Phaedrian account.

The basic identity of the stories as related by Phaedrus and Petronius does not obscure their dissimilarities. Externally the former is poetry; the latter, prose. The former is told in 164 Latin words; the latter, in 604, being virtually four times the former in length. The former contains only one line of conversation; the latter, ten lines. The former gives no indication of the scene of the action; the

latter, with characteristic artistry, locates it in the great city of Ephesus. But such outward differences are as nothing to compare with the inner ones, most of which are distinct improvements of the story.

These we may consider under four topics: the maid, the matron, the soldier, and the situation. We begin with the maid. In the Phaedrian fable she is quite incidental, appearing briefly and by chance (*forte*), occupying only a single sentence, and serving no real purpose. But she is very important in the Petronian version, playing an integral part in the account. Devoted to her mistress, she was willing to share completely the heroine's fate as well as to perform the usual tasks falling to a servant. She is the first to succumb to the soldier's proffer of food and drink. She thereupon adds her pleas to the soldier's to persuade her mistress to eat and live. It was her words which finally prevailed. And then she aided the soldier to seduce the matron. Above all, she is not only efficient and effective, but also literate, quoting Vergil's *Aeneid* twice. The story indeed hangs on the part she plays. Phaedrus could have done without her, but Petronius could not.

The matron herself is also quite differently portrayed by the two authors. In Phaedrus her fame arose from her devotion to her deceased husband. She had determined to spend the remainder of her life by his tomb, keeping vigil indeed, but otherwise practicing no austerities. When the soldier began to pay attention to her, she was slow to respond. Over a prolonged period of time he invented occasions to see her and only "little by little" was her heart at last conquered by him. Petronius relates that the matron's fame was widespread even before her husband's death, so notable indeed that women of the area came from miles around merely to catch sight of her. When her husband did die, she decided to starve herself to death lamenting at his tomb. So prominent and well-known was she that her parents and kindred besought her not to act thus, but to return to her home and live. Even the magistrates of Ephesus tried to use their authority with her but met with rebuff and finally left her

there. During what would have been her last days, high and low, rich and poor alike mourned her and kept her name and reputation alive, relating the marvel to all passing strangers. Yet, strangely enough, this paragon of virtue yielded quickly. On the very night of the soldier's first appearance, she succumbed to his food and blandishments with only a token resistance.

But of the three people the soldier provides the most interesting difference in the two treatments. In Phaedrus he simply becomes thirsty and in the most natural manner asks the servant-girl for some water. The whole proceeding is an act of chance. In Petronius, on the other hand, there is an element of suspense. The soldier saw a strange light amid the tombs and heard groans. His curiosity was piqued. And instead of his needing water, in the Petronian account he was the one who brought food and drink to the weeping women. In Phaedrus the soldier was passionately smitten by the matron's beauty at first sight. In Petronius he reeled back in shock, surprise, confusion, fear of the supernatural, of an apparition from the nether world, before he finally recognized the true situation.

He is also portrayed differently in the denouement of the stories. In Phaedrus the soldier was troubled by the theft of the body when he reported it to the matron. But in Petronius he was terrified. He frantically reported the doom that awaited him, announced his intention of suicide, and pleaded for the woman to grant him burial beside her late husband. Phaedrus laid the crime to obvious negligence, but Petronius, more subtly and more shrewdly, to listlessness or slothfulness.

Lastly, the circumstances of the story are presented in differing ways. There are no explicit references to time in the Phaedrian fable and few implicit ones. But the Petronian version offers a detailed time-scheme. It was on the fifth day of the woman's vigil that the crucifixion occurred. On the next, the sixth, night, the woman was seduced by the soldier. Assignations followed on the seventh and eighth nights. And it was apparently on the ninth night that a body was stolen from a cross.[8] In Phaedrus there is no hint of the

supernatural, but in Petronius there is a fear of phantoms and apparitions. In Phaedrus the doors of the sepulcher were closed all the time, but in Petronius the doors were significantly closed only during the seduction. In Phaedrus the crucified criminals were guilty of sacrilege and profanation, of pillaging a temple of Jupiter. In Petronius they were guilty only of robbery or banditry. And at the very end Phaedrus provides a "moral": the woman now incurred shameful disgrace in place of her former praiseworthy reputation. But Petronius cynically and immorally remarks that cleverness prevailed and the stupid people of the city could only marvel.

Before passing on, it may be worthwhile to inquire whether it is proper to designate this story as "The Faithless Widow."[9] There is not the slighest suggestion in either Phaedrus or Petronius that the woman had ever been unfaithful to her husband while he was living. Since death severs the marriage bond, the matron as widow was under no further obligation to her late husband. The tale therefore is not of a faithless widow, but of a seduction, simple enough, unusual perhaps only in its surroundings, that is, in a place of burial. In reality the soldier accomplished a worthy end by immoral means. In the Petronian acount it is obvious that the woman was bent upon suicide, which regardless of mid-first century Roman theory and practice is wrong. To save the matron from executing her purpose was therefore a good deed. And since he had saved her life, it was only just, in the denouement, for her to express gratitude by saving his life. One may and should admit that the means employed were not meritorious, but to save life and to express gratitude are not unworthy acts. It must be further admitted that the story is told quite cynically without conscious effort at moralism, but despite the cynicism of the authors the story does indeed have its own moral application, albeit unintentional.

The woman was not a "faithless widow" or, if she was, she was faithless not to her husband but to herself and then only after a manner of speaking. All the so-called analogues are therefore irrele-

vant. One such is a Rabbinic story. A rabbi, wanting to test his wife's fidelity, persuaded one of his students to arrange an assignation with her. But at the place and on the night appointed, the rabbi in disguise met his wife, made love to her, and spent the night with her. On arising the next morning the woman was so frightened when she discovered that the lover was her husband that she immediately committed suicide. It is perfectly clear that there is no relation between that story and the Latin one. The most elaborate analogue discussed by Eduard Grisebach is the one entitled, "The Matron of the Land of Sung," related in Remusat's *Contes chinois*.[10] But once again the parallel fails. The chief person in the Chinese (or Chinese-Indian) story is a philosopher, not the woman. It is a test-case like the Rabbinic tale, not a supposedly real and natural occurrence. The only true correspondence lies in a statement, "A sepulcher is at last the eternal home of all men," which is similar to the quotation in Petronius, "There is the same last home and dwelling place for all men." It is quite possible, however, that the French compiler was there influenced by the Petronian narrative. It seems to me almost incredible that this Chinese account should have ever been deemed a counterpart of the Latin story. The arbitrary designation as "the faithless widow" has probably been the misleading element.

These are only two illustrations, but there is similarly no relation between the Latin account and any of the other supposed analogues collected by Grisebach. It therefore remains that the Latin story was invented by Phaedrus and elaborated by Petronius. Thence it passed into world literature and eventually into folk-tales. Or, as noted earlier, it was the record of a real and unique incident which was notorious enough to be remembered and reduced to writing by them. It follows, then, that despite the folkloristic sound of Eumolpus's remark that he would relate a true event which happened within his memory the narrator was probably speaking the truth (that is, about the incident itself or about his reading of it in Phaedrus).

What has been quite remarkable is the discovery of close parallels

at many points to Christian sources. Detailed verbal relationships have been discussed elsewhere.[11] Here we glance for a moment at the overall picture, for there is in the Latin versions a faint undertone of the Christian (or Jewish-Christian) doctrine of vicarious atonement. Far-fetched as it may seem, here is an instance in which a crucified body saved another man's life. There is still further an intimation of either the ancient Jewish canard about the disappearing body of Christ[12] or of the Docetic heresy that only a phantom appeared to die on the cross. One can hardly avoid the impression, at least in the Petronian form, that the Christian gospel is reflected, however dimly and however perversely, in the entire story as well as in specific details.

We may summarize as follows. The story is definitely not folklore. Such an incident may have occurred in the first century A. D. and was immediately reduced to verse by Phaedrus. Petronius either knew of the occurrence by hearsay or of Phaedrus's account. In any case he elaborated it for his mocking novel by a more artistic treatment, in the course of which he made use of suggestions from Christian sources. It is just likely that it was a subconscious awareness of Christian elements that gave the story its long life in Western literature.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Jeremy Taylor, *Holy Living and Dying* (London: H. G. Bohn, 1850), pp. 516f.

[2]There is a convenient English version by Joseph B. Pike, *Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1938), pp. 361-363.

[3]Eduard Grisebach, *Die Wanderung der Novelle von der treulosen Wittwe durch die Weltlitteratur* (2d ed.; Berlin: F. & P. Lehmann, 1889), *passim.*

[4]John P. Postgate, *Phaedri Fabulae Aesopiae cum Nicolai Perotti Prologo et Decem Novis Fabulis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1919). For the matron-of-Ephesus story, see therein *Appendix Perottina,* p. xiii. On Phaedrus and his work, consult Martin Schanz and Carl Hosius, *Geschichte der romischen Literatur* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1935), pp. 447-456; Georg Wissowa and Wilhelm Kroll, *Paulys Real-Encyclopadie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft,* neue Bearbeitung (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1937), xix (2), coll. 1475-1505.

[5]Evan T. Sage, *Petronius: The Satiricon* (New York: Century Co., 1929), Introduction and Notes, *passim.* For the matron-of-Ephesus story, see therein sections

111f. (pp. 95-98). On Petronius and his work, consult Schanz and Hosius, *op. cit.*, pp. 509-520; Wissowa and Kroll, *op. cit.*, xix (1), coll. 1201-1214.

[6]Cf. Vulgate version of Mark 8:36; not noted in my papers mentioned in Note 11 below.

[7]Cf. Sage, *op. cit.*, p. 95, line 10.

[8]This enumeration may be off one day.

[9]Cf. the title to Grisebach's work, Note 3 above.

[10]Jean Pierre Abel Remusat, *Contes chinois* (Paris: Moutardier, 1827), III, 144-197.

[11]Allen Cabaniss, "A Footnote to the 'Petronian Question,'" *Classical Philology*, XLIX (April, 1954), 98-102; "The Satiricon and the Christian Oral Tradition," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, III (Winter, 1960), 36-39.

[12]See Cabaniss, "A Footnote"; Hugh J. Schonfield, *According to the Hebrews* (London: Duckworth, 1937), *passim*.

Meter and Rhyme in Chaucer's "Anelida and Arcite"

A. Wigfall Green

"Anelida and Arcite" may have been written from ten to twenty years before "Sir Thopas," probably Chaucer's greatest achievement in virtuosity of vocabulary, meter, and rhyme. Even though the material is tragic in essence, "Anelida and Arcite" becomes something of a mock-heroic poem, largely because Chaucer cannot repress the humor that wells up in him: the setting, Mt. Haemus in Thrace, becomes "the frosty contre called Trace"; Chaucer's address in the twenty-ninth stanza to "ye thrifty wymmen alle" to take example of Anelida, who "was so meke" that Arcite "loved her lyte"; Anelida's heart in stanza 31 "blak of hewe"; and Anelida's swooning in the last stanza, 45, with "face ded, betwixe pale and grene," are incongruities of which Chaucer, perhaps more than any other poet, would have awareness.

In meter and rhyme, Chaucer is quite as versatile in "Anelida and Arcite" as in "Sir Thopas." The poem as a whole is well designed: stanzas 1-3 are the "Invocation"; 4-30 "The Story"; 31 the "Proem" to "The Compleynt of Anelida"; 32-37 the "Strophe" of "The Compleynt"; 38-43 the "Antistrophe" of "The Compleynt"; 44 the "Conclusion" of "The Compleynt"; and 45 "The Story Continued."[1] The story was not completed. The following forms are used in the various stanzas:

Stanza(s)	*Rhyme*	*Number of Verses in Each Stanza*	*Number of Feet (All Iambic)*
1-30	ababbcc (rhyme royal)	7	5
31-35	aab/aab/bab	9	5
36	aaab/aaab/bbba/bbba	16	4445/4445/ 4445/4445

In the first eight verses, the *a* rhymes have four feet, the *b* rhymes five; in the last eight verses, the *b* rhymes have four feet, the *a* rhymes five. Brink[2] calls this a metabolic stanza, "constructed on the principle of the tail-rime (rime-couee)." This stanza, the fifth of the strophe, should be compared to 42, the fifth stanza of the antistrophe.

37	aab/aab/bab	9	5

Although like 31-35, this stanza, as has been pointed out by Robinson,[3] French,[4] and earlier Chaucerians, contains internal rhyme. Each verse has at least two internal rhymes, usually with a short pause after each rhyme; after the second pause, there are either one or two words, the last of which creates the end-rhyme, often a booming end-rhyme. The first four verses are typical:

> My swete foo, why do ye so, for shame?
> And thenke ye that furthered be your name
> To love a newe, and ben untrewe? Nay!
> And putte yow in sclaunder now and blame, . . .

The internal *newe-untrewe* rhymes with the *trewe* end-rhymes of stanzas 15, 21, 31, and 38. Echo, repetition, and rhyme are frequent: note *ye* in the first and second verses and *Nay* in the third, as well as *be* and *ben* in the second and third. Another verse,

> Yet come ayein, and yet be pleyn som day,

is a good example of repetition and rhyme. In the same stanza, but out of the regular rhyme scheme, *yow* and *now* are repeated and create rhyme with *yow* and *now* of the fourth verse.

Stanza 43 is of similar construction.

38-39	Like 31-35		
40	aaaaaaaaa	9	5

It should be noted that 40, the third stanza of the antistrophe, has a rhyme scheme different from that of 34, the third stanza of the strophe.

41	Like 31-35 and 38-39		
42	Like 36		
43	aab/aab/bab	9	5

Like 31-35, 38-39, and 41, stanzas 37 and 43 have the rhyme scheme aab/aab/bab; but 37 and 43 differ in that they contain internal rhyme. Such rhyme and alliteration and repetition, which also give power to this stanza, are noted by underscoring:

The longe nyght this wonder sight I drye,
And on the day for thilke afray I dye,
And of all this ryght noght, iwis, ye reche.
Ne nevere mo myn yen two be drie,
And to your routhe, and to your trouthe, I crie.
But welawey! to fer be they to feche;
Thus holdeth me my destinee a wreche.
But me to rede out of this drede, or guye,
Ne may my wit, so weyk is hit, not streche.

Nyght, 1, and *ryght,* 3, rhyme, as do *day,* 2; *ye,* 3; be, 4 and 6; *they,* 6; *me,* 7 and 8; and *may,* 9. The combination of repetition and rhyme in *to your routhe* and *to your trouthe* in 5 is quite effective, as is the assonance created in *I* in 1, 2, and 5, followed by *drye, dye,* and *crie,* the last word in each of those verses.

44 Like 31-35, 38-39, and 41

45 Like 1-30

The forty-five stanzas in "Anelida and Arcite" contain the following rhymes:

Stanza	*Rhyme*	*Other Stanza(s) and Rhyme*
1	*rede-drede*	40 *womanhede-dede-nede-lede-drede-bede-mede-sede-hede*
	Trace-place-grace	6 *face-grace*
	guye-crye	10 *espye-tyrannye;* 18 *flaterie-jelousye;* 22 *bigamye-lye;* 23 *traitorie-trecherie-espie;* 43 *drye-dye-drie-crie-guye*
2	*Arcite-bite*	7 *write-Arcite;* 16 *lyte-Arcite-wite;* 25 *lyte-Arcite;* 29 *Arcite-lyte-delyte;* 30 *write-Arcite;* 36 *respite-quyte-Arcite-write-delyte-wite-myte-byte*
	storie-memorie	5 *victorie-glorie*
3	*glade-shade-fade*	6 *hadde-ladde-spradda* (proximate)
	wynne-Corynne	15 *wynne-twynne-synne*
4	*wente-entente*	19 *entente-wente;* 23 *mente-wente*
6	*quene-shene*	11 *quene-shene;* 20 *quene-tene;* 21 *grene-quene;* 24 *quene-tene;* 26 *sustene-tene-grene;* 45 *quene-grene*
7	*thus-Theseus*	9 *Tydeus-Campaneus*
	yevynge-rydinge-bringe	11 *dwellynge-springe-likynge;* 27 *lyvynge-singe;* 30 *langwisshinge-wepinge-compleynynge*
8	*fulfille-kille-stille*	28 *fille-wille*
9	*also-two-ago*	14 *so-a-two*
12	*fairenesse-stidfast-*	15 *besynesse-distresse;* 21 *newfangle-*

	nesse-Lucresse	*nesse-stidfastnesse;* 35 *gentilesse-humblesse-besynesse-maistresse-hevynesse;* 39 *unkyndenesse-gladness-hevynesse-witnesse*
13	*seyn-pleyn*	30 *ageyn-geyn;* 41 *ageyn-reyn-sovereyn-slayn-feyn*
	knyght-wyght-bryght	17 *wyght-myght-knyght;* 32 *wight-myght-knyght-ryght-plyght*
	assure-creature	42 *aventure-creature-discomfiture-endure-figure-asure-asure*
14	*throwe-lowe-yknowe*	28 *knowe-lowe*
	chere-lere	16 *manere-chere;* 18 *here-swere;* 35 *manere-here-chere-dere;* 45 *chere-here*
15	*rewe-trewe*	21 *trewe-newe-hewe;* 31 *hewe-trewe-rewe-newe;* 38 *trewe-newe-rewe-hewe*
20	*thoght-broght*	39 *soght-thoght-noght-oght-broght*
22	*noon-agoon*	24 *ston-agon-noon*
23	*feyne-pleyne*	33 *deyne-peyne-restreyne-pleyne;* 38 *seyne-pleyne-cheyne-tweyne-peyne*
31	*remembraunce-plesaunce-daunce-countenaunce - observaunce*	44 *balaunce-penaunce-chaunce-remembraunce*

The first verse of this stanza, which is the proem to "The Compleynt of Anelida,"

So thirleth with the poynt of remembraunce

closely parallels the last verse of stanza 44, which is the conclusion,

Hath thirled with the poynt of remembraunce.

34	*more-yore-lore-evermore*	44 *more-evermore-lore-yore-sore*

The rhymes are appropriate when serious, and delightful when humorous: Anelida, in 11 and 45, is the *quene-shene;* Arcite causes *tene* in 20, 24, and 26. Anelida, in 12, has *fairenesse* and, in her *stidfastnesse,* 21, is like *Lucresse* in 12. Having become *maistresse* of Arcite, who no longer has *gentilesse* and *humblesse* because of his *besynesse* elsewhere, she can have only *hevynesse* in 35. She must, in 39, flee from *gladnesse* to *hevynesse* without *witnesse* because of his *unkyndenesse.* In stanza 1 the author says that he must *crye* to Mars to *guye* him; in 43, Anelida makes her *crie* to Arcite because her wit cannot *guye* her, and the sorrow she must *drye* causes her to *crie* so that her eyes will not be *drie,* and she must *dye.* The *tyrannye* of Creon in 10 leads naturally to the *flaterie* and *jelousye* of Arcite in 18, to the *bigamye* of 22, and to *traitorie* and *trecherie* in 23.

There is occasional rhyme of proper names within themselves: *Theseus* in 7 and *Tydeus-Campaneus* in 9; sometimes a proper noun, like *Arcite* in 2, appears to establish the rhyme for common nouns.

The rhyme of one stanza sometimes is merely repeated in another: *quene-shene* in 6 and 11. At other times it is repeated with increment: *wyght-myght-knyght* of 17 becomes *wight-myght-knyght-ryght-plyght* of 32; and occasionally, as in 36, there seems to be an attempt to repeat all previously used rhymes: *Arcite-write-delyte-wite-byte.*

Sometimes the spelling determines the rhyme: *seyn-pleyn* in stanza 13, with additional rhyme in 30 and 41, do not rhyme with *pleyne* in 23 or with similar rhymes in 33 and 38; nor do *upbreyde-obeyde* of 17 rhyme with *seyd-apaid-breyd* of 18.

Although two final syllables are spelled identically, if there is no correspondence of accented vowel sound there is no rhyme: *throwe-lowe-yknowe* of 14 and *knowe-lowe* of 28 do not rhyme with *narowe-arowe* of 27.

Stanza 40 is something of a proving-ground for rhyme: although the material is basically serious, the multiplicity of rhyme makes the entire stanza comic: *womandede-dede-nede-lede-drede-bede-mede-sede-hede.*

In addition to links in language between the various stanzas, there are sometimes links between the first and last verses of a stanza, as in 18:

> And eke he made him *jelous* over here,
> . . . . . .
> Withoute love, he feyned *jelousye.*

Sometimes the repetitions approximate refrain. *Anelida* and *Arcite* are contrasted in the following stanzas, as are *false* and *fair*:

> 7 Of quene Anelida and fals Arcite.
> 20 Thus lyveth feire Anelida the quene
> For fals Arcite, that dide her al this tene.
> 21 This fals Arcite, of his newfanglenesse,
> . . . . . .
> And falsed fair Anelida the quene.
> 23 This fals Arcite, sumwhat moste he feyne
> 24 That suffreth fair Anelida the quene.

"Anelida and Arcite" is not the most attractive of Chaucer's works, but it is an important experiment in language, meter, and rhyme.

To recapitulate, the narrative of the poem, comprising stanzas 1-30 and 45, is written in rhyme royal, ababbcc. Stanza 31, the proem to "The compleynt of Anelida," is like stanzas 32-35, 37-39, 41, and 43-44 in that the stanza of nine verses is used, containing only two rhymes, aab/aab/bab. After the proem, the next six stanzas comprise a strophe, stanzas 32-37; the strophe is followed by an antistrophe, consisting also of six stanzas, 38-43. To give symmetry to "The compleynt," the antistrophe is followed by a conclusion, stanza 44, which counterbalances the proem.[5] The master architect of poetry has also given balance to strophe and antistrophe in designing sixteen verses for the fifth stanza of the strophe and the fifth stanza of the antistrophe, each stanza, however, containing only two rhymes, like the remainder of the stanzas of "The compleynt." Each of these stanzas, 36 and 42, is arranged in units of four, aaab/aaab/bbba/bbba, the second half being tied to the first half by the *b* rhyme. To vary

his general pattern, Chaucer placed an extra foot in every fourth verse; thus the twelve verses of lyrical lament are exalted to the heroic level by the introduction of four verses of five feet each. One might expect a similar rhyme scheme in the third stanza of the strophe and the third stanza of the antistrophe, stanzas 34 and 40. Stanza 34, however, has the usual arrangement and the rhyme scheme of the majority of stanzas in "The compleynt," aab/aab/bab, in which the *b* rhymes of the third tercet neatly link themselves with the *b* rhymes of the first two tercets. These stanzas, then, unlike stanzas 36 and 42 which are arranged in units of four, are arranged in units of three. But Chaucer provides a welcome asymmetry in stanza 40 in making it rhyme aaaaaaaaa, thus establishing himself as a poetic virtuoso. But, as if to demonstrate that the highest art has not only a pattern but variey within that pattern, he introduced internal rhyme into the sixth and last stanza of the strophe and of the antistrophe, as previously indicated. The conclusion of "The compleynt," stanza 44, is in the same metrical form as the proem, stanza 31. The last stanza of the poem, 45, in which Chaucer resumed the narrative, is in the same metrical form as the first stanza of the poem. Thus Chaucer has rounded out not only "The compleynt" but also the poem as a whole even though the poem was not completed.

In his use of balance, antithesis, repetition, and alliteration, Chaucer is at his best in "The compleynt." Here also, as in "My swete foo" of 37, he uses oxymoron, later so precious to the poet of the Renaissance. In the first stanza of the strophe, 32, five of the nine verses begin with *And,* the type of polysyndeton which Shakespeare developed to the ultimate in sonnet 66, in which ten of the fourteen verses begin with the same conjunction.

Throughout the poem Chaucer ingeniously links stanza with stanza: "fals Arcite" in the last verse of stanza 20 prepares for "This fals Arcite," the first three words of 21, in which *falsed* is used in the last verse; *fals* appears twice in 22; the opening of 23 is identical to the opening of 21, "This fals Arcite," and is followed by *fals* and *falsnes;*

this group of five stanzas, 20-24, is brought to near perfection, but with a change in mood, by closing 20 with the couplet:

> Thus lyveth feire Anelida the quene
> For fals Arcite, that dide her al this tene.

and 24 with the couplet:

> That suffreth fair Anelida the quene
> For fals Arcite, that dide her al this tene.

Various stanzas, as previously suggested, have also been skillfully interwoven by rhyme. The first two rhyming words of stanza 1, *rede-drede,* provide rhyme for the nine rhymes of stanza 40; the concluding couplet of stanza 1, rhyming *guye-crye,* creates a bond with 43 in which the rhyme is inverted to *crie-guye;* the four rhyming words of 34 reappear in four of the five rhyming words of 44; the first rhyme of stanza 6, *quene-shene,* becomes the first rhyme in stanza 11 and rhymes with *quene-grene* of 45, the last stanza.

In "Anelida and Arcite" there are five distinct types of stanza. There is merit, therefore, in the statement of Lounsbury[6] that the poem contains "unusual metrical forms" and "daring experiments in versification." In skill of versification, poetry has not excelled that of stanzas 36, 37, 40, 42, and 43.

FOOTNOTES

[1]*The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer,* ed. Walter W. Skeat (2d ed.; Oxford, 1899), I, 529. The arrangement of Skeat has been followed by most later scholars.

[2]Bernhard ten Brink, *The Language and Metre of Chaucer Set Forth,* 2d ed., rev. Friedrich Kluge; trans. M. Bentinck Smith (London, 1901), p. 257.

[3]*The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer,* ed. F. N. Robinson (2d ed.; Boston, 1957), p. 790; quotations from the poem have been taken from this edition.

[4]Robert Dudley French, *A Chaucer Handbook* (New York, 1929), p. 101.

[5]Cf. Frederick J. Furnivall, *A Parallel-Text Edition of Chaucer's Minor Poems,* Chaucer Soc., 1st Ser., No. 57-58, Pt. II (London, n.d.), p. 145.

[6]Thomas R. Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer* (New York, 1892), III, 309.

Notes on *A Midsummer Night's Dream*

James E. Savage

There is almost universal agreement among scholars that *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was written for a special occasion, perhaps a wedding within the ranks of Elizabeth's nobility. The list of possible marriages is large. In *William Shakespeare,* E. K. Chambers rejects for various reasons all but two possibilities: the marriage of William, Earl of Derby to Elizabeth Vere at Greenwich on 26 January, 1595; and that of Thomas Berkeley to Elizabeth Carey on 19 February, 1596. Either wedding, he says, "would fit such indications of date as the play yields."[1]

It is my intention in this paper to suggest the Berkeley-Carey wedding as the more likely candidate, on the basis of a passage which could well be an elaborate compliment to the parents of the groom. The passage, which follows, occurs near the end of Act IV, upon the arrival of Theseus and Hippolyta in the forest:

Winde Hornes.

Enter Theseus, Egeus, Hippolita and all his traine.

Thes. Goe one of you, finde out the Forrester,
For now our obseruation is perform'd;
And since we haue the vaward of the day,
My Loue shall heare the musicke of my hounds.
Vncouple in the Westerne valley, let them goe;
Dispatch I say, and finde the Forrester.
We will faire Queene, vp to the Mountaines top.
And marke the musicall confusion
Of hounds and eccho in coniunction.

Hip. I was with *Hercules* and *Cadmus* once,

When in a wood of *Creete* they bayed the Beare
With hounds of *Sparta;* and neuer did I heare
Such gallant chiding. For besides the groues,
The skies, the fountaines, euery region neere,
Seeme all one mutuall cry. I neuer heard.
So musicall a discord, such sweet thunder.
Thes. My hounds are bred out of the *Spartan* kinde
So flew'd, so sanded, and their heads are hung
With eares that sweepe away the morning dew,
Crooke kneed, and dew-lapt, like *Thessalian* Buls,
Slow in pursuit, but match'd in mouth like bels,
Each vnder each. A cry more tuneable
Was neuer hallowed to, nor cheer'd with horne,
In *Creete,* in *Sparta,* nor in *Thessaly;*
Iudge when you heare.[2] (IV, 1, 107-131)

This rather self-conscious passage serves to bring the Duke and his Amazon into the forest on an appropriate mission, hunting and their "obseruation." Their presence, or something of a similar nature, is needed to end the "dreame," and to provide a return to the court and to reality. While the music of the hounds and their physiognomy are of interest in themselves, and appropriate to a pastoral setting, one feels inevitably that their presence must serve some end outside the strict conduct of the action. The likelihood of some allusive intention in the passage is heightened, of course, by the far more obvious reference elsewhere in the play to the "faire Vestall, throned by the West."

The groom of the Berkeley-Carey wedding was Thomas, the son of "Sir Henry Berkeley, Knt. Lord Berkeley," the seventh lord. Of Sir Henry, one reads in the *Dictionary of National Biography,* "This Lord was a mighty hunter." The source of much of the information about the Berkeleys of Elizabeth's time is one John Smyth, "of Nibley," their steward. The passages quoted below[3] concerning the habits and tastes of Lord and Lady Berkeley offer a fairly strong pre-

sumption that, in the lines of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* quoted above, Shakespeare is offering a compliment to the parents of the groom.

> This young Lord [Sir Henry] went to London, settled at Tower-hill, frequented the Court, and spent his time at tenys, bowles, cards, dice, and in the company of huntsmen and falconers . . . . While this Lord lived with his mother at Kentish Town, and Shoe-lane in London, he hunted dayly in Gray's-inn-fields, and in those parts toward Islington and Heygate, with his hounds, and had 150 servants in livery, that daily attended him in tawny coats. (pp. 185-186)
>
> In September, 2 Mary, this Lord married Lady Catharine Howard, at the Duke her father's house in Norfolke, whom shortly after he brought to his house at Tower-hill. (p. 186)
>
> In July, 1 Elizabeth, he returned to Risinge; and from thence, with his wife and family, by the wayes of Newmarket, Cambridge, and Northampton, came to Callowden by Coventry, where the first work done was the sending for his buck-hounds to Yate in Gloucestershire. His hounds being come, away goeth he and his wife a progress of buck-hunting to the parks of Barkwell, Groby, Brodgate, Leicester forest, Tiley and others, on this side his house, and after a small repose, then the parks of Kenilworth, Ashley, Wedgnnocke, and others on the other side of his house; and this was the course of this Lord more or less, for the next thirty summers at least; and his wife, being of like honor and youth, from the first of Elizabeth, to the beheading of her brother the Duke of Norfolk, thirteen years after, gave herself to like delights, as the country affordeth, wherein she often went with her husband part of these hunting journeys, delighting in her crossbowe, keeping commonly a cast or two of merlins, which sometimes she mewed in her own chamber, which falconry cost her husband each year

one or two gowns and kirtles spoyled by their mutinges; used her long-bowe, and was in those days amongst her servants so good an archer at butts, that her side by her was not the weaker, whose haws, arrowes, gloves, bracer, scarfe and other lady-like accommodations, I have seen, and heard herself speak of them in her elder years. (p. 188)

This Lord had many flatterers and sycophants, as well of his own family as out of London, captains, scholars, poets, cast courtiers, and the like, that for their private ends humored him and his wife. (p. 189)

The Earl of Leicester, when he was endeavouring to inveigle Lord Berkeley into a consent to see certain of his evidences, invited that Lord to his castle of Kenilworth, "lodginge him, as a brother and fellow huntsman, in his owne chamber." (p. 190)

But his chief delight, wherein he spent near three parts of the year, were, to his great charges, in hunting bores, fox, and deer, red and fallow, not wanting the charge of as good hunting horses as yearly he could buy at faires in the North; and in hawking both at river and at land: and as his hounds were held inferior to no man's (through the great choice of whelps), with much care he yearly bred his choicest braches; and his contynuall huntinges, soe were his hawkes of several sorts, which, if he sent not a man to fetch beyond seas, as three or four times I remember he did, yet had he the choyce assone as they were brought over into England, keeping a man lodginge in London in some yeares a month or more, to be sure of his choyce at their first landinge, especially for his haggard falcons for the run, wherein he had two that fell in one after the other, and lasted twelve or more years, the one called Stella, and the other Kate. They were famous with all great Faulkeners in many counties, and were prized at excessive rates, esteemed for high

> and round flyinge, free stoupinge, and other conditions, inferior to none in Christendome, whom myself, in my younger yeares, waytinge upon his son Thomas, then not twelve years old, at Birely Brooke, have, in the height of pitch, lost sight of in a cleere eveninge. (p. 198)
>
> Queen Elizabeth, in her progress, fifteenth year of her reign, came to Berkeley Castle what time this Lord had a stately game of red deer in the parke adjoyninge, called the Worthy, whereof Henry Ligon was keeper: during which time of her being there, such slaughter was made as twenty-seven stagges were slayne in the toyles in one day, and many others on that and the next stollen and havocked; whereof when this Lord, being then at Callowden, was advertised, having much set his delight in this game, he sodainely and passionately disparked that ground. (p. 203)
>
> THOMAS, the Son and heir, was born at Callowden July 11, 17 Elizabeth, *anno* 1575, the Queen being his Godmother by proxy. (p 213)
>
> This Sir Thomas, then lodging with his father at Thomas Johnson's house in Fleet Street, formed such an affection for Elizabeth Carey, only child of Sir George Carey, son of Sir Henry Hunsdon, then living at his house in the Black Friars, that they were married 19 February, 1595. (p. 213)

The instruction of Theseus to uncouple in the "Westerne valley" may have only generalized significance, such as that in the phrase "fair Vestall throned by the West." It might, however, be a specific reference to the location of Berkeley Castle, in Gloucestershire, on a hill overlooking the marshes of the Severn estuary.[4] Shakespeare would perhaps have had more than casual knowledge of the hunts of the Berkeley family, for the parks referred to by Smyth in the third paragraph above are at no great distance from Stratford. Young Thomas Berkeley, the groom, was born at Callowden, in Warwickshire.

The village of Stratford is in southern Warwickshire, very near the northern tip of Gloucestershire, and very near the Cotswolds.

Shakespeare's interest in and knowledge of Gloucestershire is manifested by such a passage as this from *Richard II*:

> *Bul.* How farre is it my Lord to Berkeley now?
> *Nor.* Beleeue me noble Lord
> I am a stranger heere in Gloustershire,
> These high wild hilles, and rough vneeuen waies,
> Drawes out our miles, and makes them wearisome:
> . . . . . .
> But I bethinke me, what a wearie way
> From Rauenspurgh to Cottshold will be found
> In *Rosse* and *Willoughby*. (*Richard II*, II, iii, 1-5, 7-10)

One of the scenes of *Richard II* is set in Berkeley Castle, and a Lord Berkeley, loyal to Richard, is the subject of Bolingbroke's rebuke for calling him Hereford rather than Lancaster.

A much more notable evidence, however, of Shakespeare's interest in Gloucestershire lies in the scenes involving Justice Shallow and his friends. Both the Justice and his colleague Silence are residents of that county, and in *II Henry IV* are twice visited there by Falstaff. Among the subjects of their reminiscences is Will Squeale, a "Cotsall man." In the *Merry Wives of Windsor* also, Justice Shallow and his protege Slender are of Gloucestershire, even though they seem very much at home in the atmosphere of Windsor. And that substantial citizen of Windsor, George Page, has interest in the neighboring county, for he has recently had his "fallow Greyhound" "out-run on Cotsall."

That Shakespeare had an accurate and far-reaching knowledge of the terms and practices of the hunt is made abundantly clear in, for example, Madden's *The Diary of Master William Silence*.[5]

Such matters as these all suggest that Shakespeare might have had both the knowledge of the mystery of hunting and the habits of the Berkeley family, not only to write a play for the nuptials of the

heir, but also to pay them so graceful a compliment as that contained in the beautiful tribute to Theseus and Hippolyta and the hounds of Spartan kind.

When it is noted that the bride-to-be in the Berkeley-Carey wedding was the granddaughter of Henry Carey, Lord Hunsdon, the Lord Chamberlain, and the newly-found patron of Shakespeare's newly-founded company, it seems quite likely indeed that *A Midsummer Night's Dream,* if written in honor of any marriage, was written to honor these neighbors and patrons.

II

Aside from the possibility that the passage quoted above from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* may serve to identify the particular wedding for which the play was written, it raises several other questions of minor interest. Why are Shakespeare's hounds so musical, when the Berkeley family, apparently devotees of hunting, and specialists in hounds, hawks, and horses, are not concerned about the voices of their hounds? Why hounds of Sparta? What kind of hounds of his own day would Shakespeare have had in mind?

Perhaps the last of these questions should be approached first. Information on the art, almost the ritual, of hunting is abundant, as for example, in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight,* and in *The Book of Saint Albans.* The latter of these can also be helpful with reference to the appearance and habits of the hounds themselves. Printed at Saint Albans in 1486,[6] it contains a treatise on hunting which is associated in the *Dictionary of National Biography* and elsewhere with the name of "Dame Juliana Berners." In the *Book of Saint Albans* itself the name appears as "Dam Julyans Barnes."[7] She names a goodly number of "houndis," but she describes only two, the "grehounde" and the "lymer." But neither of these, both of which are bred primarily for speed, has the characteristics of the Spartan kind so highly prized by Theseus. There are, however, in this set of verses, two or three suggestions which will prove useful:

My dere sonnys echeon now I you lere
How many maner beestys as with the lymere
Shall be upreryde in fryth or in felde
Booth the hart and the bucke and the boore so wilde
And all other beestys that huntid shall be
Shall be sought and founde with the Ratchis so fre
Say thus I yow tolde: my childer so bolde. (e4)

The terminology of Dame Julyans is highly specialized: the terms "hart"[8] and "bucke"[9] are reserved for animals in the sixth year of their growth, and "boore" for one in the fourth year.[10] All other animals, according to the lady, are to be hunted with the "Ratchis so fre." What the ratchis is, however, she does not tell us.

Dame Julyans' treatise, though published in 1486, was probably written in the first half of the fifteenth century. Containing as it did also treatises on hawking and on heraldry, *The Book of Saint Albans* was apparently a very popular manual, not only for the would-be hunter, but for anyone who might wish to know how "gentilmen shall be knowyn from ungentill men." By 1586 it had, according to the *Short Title Catalogue*,[11] appeared, in whole or in part, in nine editions; according to its editor Blades, there had been fourteen editions.

In seeking to identify the dogs of his own day which Shakespeare may have used in creating the noble hounds of Theseus, we have thus far only the unidentified "Ratchis" of Dame Julyans. A more meticulous account, not only of hunting dogs, but of all dogs, is that contained in the pamphlet "Of Englishe Dogges . . . A Short Treatise written in Latine by Johannes Caius, of late memorie . . . newly drawne into Englishe by Abraham Fleming Student."[12] Its date is 1576. Doctor Caius engages in a much lower flight than Dame Julyans, being content with describing the appearance and function of the dog, without instructing the hunter in his mystery. His accounts of the lyemmer[13] and the greyhound clearly eliminate

them as breeds of his own day that Shakespeare might have had in mind for the hounds of Theseus.

He does, however, describe two breeds in language not unlike that which the poet puts in the mouth of the Duke. He speaks first of the "Harrier, in Latine Leuerarius,"

> whose property it is to vse a lustiness, a readines, and a courageousnes in hunting . . . . Wee may knowe these kinde of Dogges by their long, large, and bagging lippes, by their hanging eares, reachyng downe both sydes of their chappes, and by the indifferent and measurable proportion of their making. (p. 3)

There is perhaps a better candidate for the native original than the harrier, the "Bloudhounde in Latine Sanguinarius." While the Doctor devotes most of his space, perhaps as much as two pages, to the proclivities for which the bloodhound is principally noted today, he gives us several items of information which may be useful:

> The greater sort which serue to hunt, hauing lippes of a large syze & eares of no small lenght, doo, not only chase the beast whiles it liueth (as the other doo of whom mencion aboue is made) but beyng dead also by any maner of casualtie, make recourse to the place where it lyeth, hauing in this poynt an assured and infallible guyde, namely, the sent and sauour of the bloud sprinckled heere and there vpon the ground.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> And albeit some of this sort in English be called *Brache,* in Scottishe *Rache,* the cause hereof resteth in the shee sex and not in the generall kinde . . . . To bee short it is proper to the nature of houndes, some to keepe silence in hunting untill such tyme as there is game offered. Other some so soone as they smell out the place where the beast lurcketh, to bewray it immediately by their importunate barcking, notwithstanding it be farre of many furlongs cowchyng close

> in his cabbyn. And these Dogges the younger they be, the more wantonly barcke they, and the more liberally, yet oftimes without necessitie, so that in them, by reason of theyr young yeares and want of practise, small certaintie is to be reposed. (pp. 5-8)

It is not my intention to argue that Shakespeare used as a direct source either of the treatises from which I have quoted passages, though of course either would have been available to him, the *Book of Saint Albans* apparently in great abundance. I do suggest that from them we have a fairly accurate account of the hunting dogs that Shakespeare probably saw in his youth in Warwickshire. We probably know something of the sort of hounds in which the elder Berkeleys took so much pride.

Many of the elements in Theseus' description of his hounds have been accounted for in these passages from the writings of Dame Julyans and Doctor Caius: ears, lips, "proportion of their making." In Dame Julyans' account we learn that it is the function of the "Ratchis" to hunt all "beestys" but hart and buck and boar, presumably because their greater maturity demands greater speed in their pursuer, the "lymere" and so, by implication at least, a foundation is laid for the fact that the hounds of Theseus are "slow in pursuit." Doctor Caius has given us "*Rache*" or "*Brache*," which is of course identifiable with the Dame's "Rachis," as an alternate name for the bloodhound.[14]

The element most notably unaccounted for in two treatises is the music of the hounds of Theseus. In the account of Doctor Caius, the distinction of "barckyng" belongs almost exclusively to the bloodhounds.[15] The Doctor regards it as without necessity, an undesirable trait in the younger dogs, in whom "small certainty is to be reposed." Dame Julyans does not assign the practice to any particular breed, but she gives the cause and the occasion for it, in whatever hound it may occur:

> Yit wolde I witt maister whi theys houndes all
> Bayen and cryen when thay hym ceche shall

For thay wolde haue helpe that is thayr skill
For to flee [flay] the beest that they renne tyll. (e8)

It appears, from these two treatises, both current about the time of Shakespeare's writing, that the bloodhound, and the harrier to a lesser extent, display the characteristics of the hounds of Theseus — except for the music of the "mutuall cry."

Perhaps its source is to be found in an entirely different realm. In his article "Sidney's Influence upon *A Midsummer Night's Dream*"[16] Michel Poirer points out that Shakespeare was for his portrait of the hounds probably indebted to a passage in Book I of the *Arcadia*. He stresses particularly the choral quality achieved by the conjunction of horns, hunters' voices, hounds, and echo. He also notes that Shakespeare and Sidney are alike in the matter of the pitch of voices, "each vnder each." The relevant passages in the *Arcadia* are concerned with a hunt on which Kalander is accompanied by Pryocles and Musidorus:

> The sunne (how great a jornie soever he had to make) could never prevent him with earlines.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> they came to the side of the wood, where the houndes were in couples staying their comming, but with a whining Accent craving libertie: many of them in colour and marks so resembling, that it showed they were of one kinde. The huntsmen handsomely attired in their greene liveries, as though they were children of the Sommer, with staves in their hands to beat the guiltlesse earth, when the houndes were at a fault, and with hornes about their neckes to sounde an alarum upon a sillie fugitive.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Their crie being composed of so well sorted mouthes, that any man would perceive therein some kind of proportion, but the skilfull woodman did finde a musick. Then delight and varietie of opinion drew the horsmen sundrie wayes; yet

> cheering their houndes with voyce and horn, kept still (as it were) together. The wood seemed to conspire with them against its own citizens, dispersing their noise through all his quarters; and even the Nimph *Echo* left to bewayle the losse of *Narcissus,* and became a hunter.[17]

In addition to the choral quality and the pitch of the voices, the two passages have other things in common: the earliness of the morning; the delight of the hearers; "sanded" and "colour and marks"; the "forrester" and the "hunts men"; the word "couple."[18]

Missing from Sidney's passage are Hercules and Cadmus, and the places — Crete, Sparta, and Thessaly. Yet the hunting of the two mythical heroes in Shakespeare's passage was with "hounds of *Sparta,*" and the hounds of Theseus are "bred out of the *Spartan* kinde." I suggest that the designation "Spartan" is chosen as an indirect tribute to the *Arcadia* and its author rather than as a designation of any particular breed, or as a direct influence of any classical writing.[19] Most of the action of the *Arcadia* occurs on the borders of Arcadia and Laconia, and the heroes of the work are much concerned in the affairs of the Lacadaemonians and the helots. As a final note of speculation about the influence of Sidney on Shakespeare, I suggest that the "beare" bayed by Hercules and Cadmus may have a kinship with the strange pursuer of Pamela and Philoclea:

> When sodainly there came out of a wood a monstrous Lion with a she Beare not far from him, of litle lesse fiercenes, which (as they ghest) having been huted in Forests far of, were by chauce come thether, where before such beastes had never bene seene. (p. 119)

This wonderful passage from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* certainly belongs in the heart of the play, in the world of fantasy, of the wood, of the dream. Its hounds, not inconsistent with those so important in the affairs of the great families like the Berkeleys, idealized perhaps through suggestions from Sidney, are of a kind with Puck and Oberon and Titania.

FOOTNOTES

[1]E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1930), I, 358-359.

[2]The text used for all quotations from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and other plays is that of the first folio as given in the facsimile of the Yale University Press.

[3]Thomas Dudley Fosbroke (ed.), *The Berkeley Manuscripts: Abstracts and Extracts of Smyth's Lives of the Berkeleys* (London, 1821), pp. 184-218.

[4]*The Itinerary of John Leland,* ed. Lucy Toulmin Smith (London, 1907), V, 101.

[5]D. H. Madden, *The Diary of Master William Silence* (London, 1907).

[6]William Blades (ed.), *The Boke of Saint Albans, by Dame Juliana Berners* (reproduced in facsimile; London, 1881).

[7]"What is really known of the Dame is almost nothing, and may be summed up in the following words. She probably lived at the beginning of the fifteenth century, and she probably compiled from existing MSS some rhymes on Hunting." *Ibid.,* "Introduction," p. 13.

[8]*Ibid.,* el[v].

[9]*Ibid.,* e4.

[10]*Ibid.,* e3.

[11]The tenth edition, according to the *Short Title Catalogue,* probably too late for consideration in connection with *A Midsummer Night's Dream,* is "The gentlemans academie, or the booke of S. Albans reduced into a better method by G. M[arkham]," 1595.

[12]Imprinted at London by Rychard Johnes, 1576. Quoted here from a facsimile, "Reprinted from the original by Milo G. Denlinger, Washington, D.C."

[13]Madden, in the *Diary,* regards the lymmer as being the hound used in any hunting of which Shakespeare might have had knowledge. The name is derived from LIAM, or leash.

[14]Perhaps the identifications made here throw some light on one of Edgar's speeches in *King Lear*:

> Mastiffe, Grey-hound, Mongrill, Grim
> Hound or Spaniell, Brache, or Hym,
> Or Bobtaile tight, or Troudle taile.
> Tom will make him weepe and waile,
> For with throwing thus my head;
> Dogs leapt the hatch, and all are fled. (III, 7, 71-76)

Edgar is clearly in this passage giving a list of breeds, and it hardly seems likely that he means for one of his breeds "bitch," or "female." Yet most annotators give such a meaning for "Brache," and bloodhound for "Hym." Cf. G. B. Harrison, ed., *Major Plays* (New York, 1948), or Louis B. Wright and Virginia A. LaMar, *King Lear* (New York, 1960). Both Dame Julyans and Doctor Caius give us authority for annotating the brache as the bloodhound, and the lymmer as himself. In a similar manner the speech of the Fool in *King Lear* (I, 1, 11), "when the Lady Brache may stand by th' fire and stinke," may be interpreted without some such subterfuge as making "Lady" a proper name.

[15]He does attribute to the "Gasehounde," which hunts by sight, "a cleare voyce" (p. 9).

[16]*Studies in Philology,* XLIV (January, 1947), 483-489.

[17]Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia,* ed. Albert Feuillerat (Cambridge, 1912), pp. 59-61.

[18]Dame Julyans may have a slight responsibility for Shakespeare's use of the word "vncouple" as a part of the instructions of Theseus. In a long list entitled "The Compaynys of beestys and fowlis" she authorizes the designations "a Copull of spaynellis" and "a Couple of rennyng houndis."

[19]It is possible that Ovid, through the *Metamorphoses,* could have influenced Shakespeare here. Actaeon, having inadvertently seen Diana bathing, was by the Goddess turned into a stag. He was pursued and destroyed by his own hounds, one of which, Melampus, a Spartan hound, led the pursuit. Reference to Actaeon, or rather to his horns, is made by Tamora in *Titus Andronicus* (II, 3, 63) and by Pistol (II, 1, 22) and Ford (III, 2, 44) in *Merry Wives of Windsor.*

The Poet of Love and the *Parlement of Foules*

Donald C. Baker

Of Chaucer's four vision poems, the *Parlement of Foules* is, without a doubt, the most closely integrated, firm-textured, and, notwithstanding its superficial simplicity, the most complex. Lowes has spoken of it, and rightly so, as "seamless."[1] Few critics indeed, though many have regarded it as a precious trifle, have quibbled with its composition, and these have been limited for the most part to those readers who failed to find important connections between the preliminary reading of the *Somnium Scipionis* and the rest of the poem.[2] Twentieth century scholars and critics have nearly always seen the poem as tightly unified, although in many cases the reasons given for the unity were highly individual. In any case, this trend is once again indicative of the swelling theme predominating in recent Chaucer criticism, namely, that Chaucer is more than a good poet with an earthy sense of humor; he is a genius of the first order who must be read closely and with the same sort of unswerving attention required by Donne or Shakespeare, for, as Preston remarks in considering this poem, "Without distorting his lucid diction, Chaucer has written with a complexity that makes the complication of most verse today appear a child's puzzle."[3]

In examining the *Parlement* this study will attempt an investigation into the nature of this Chaucerian complexity. For, one can observe, it arises from no series of encrusted conceits as do Donne's complexities, and, at times, Shakespeare's. Although he has produced a number of beautiful lyrics, Chaucer is not primarily a lyricist nor is he a dialectical poet; he is a narrative poet, first and foremost, with a

story to tell and a theme to convey. The way in which his verse delivers this theme, tightly integrated with imagery and reinforced by this imagery translated into symbolical sub-structure, deepened and broadened by his peculiar "allusive" texture and symbolism curiously akin to that of the Augustans and to a certain aspect of Eliot and Pound, is the base of the Chaucerian complexity, lurking innocently beneath the even flow of his translucent diction. Not until the best of the *Canterbury Tales* do we encounter such a fine example of Chaucer's swift, incisive, and curiously anonymous style as we have in the *Parlement of Foules.*

As in the case of the *House of Fame,* this poem has been buried under tons of scholarly disputation, seeking to establish an historical "meaning" or application for the poem. The assumption that the *Parlement of Foules* is an occasional poem with allegorical reference to real people and events has for so long been so universal that the modern reader would be foolish indeed to assume otherwise without careful weighing of the arguments. The modern reader, schooled in *in vacuo* explicatory criticism, would, of course, like to discard such appendages, but, unfortunately, it is impossible to approach a Chaucer poem with the *a priori* assumption that one will find no allegorical or historical basis for its composition, for we have always before us the fact that Chaucer did, almost indisputably, write one such poem, the *Book of the Duchess,* and that there was no ordinance forbidding its repetition. The arguments for the *Parlement's* being a somewhat similar occasional poem are strong indeed (as a general idea, not that any specific application is convincing) and any critic's interpretation of the poem must come to some sort of terms with such a likelihood, before he proceeds beyond it (as, of course, he must, if he is to be a critic of literature rather than an historian).

The commonly accepted date of the *Parlement* is 1382 or thereabouts.[4] This is the result of the more or less general agreement that the allegorical structure of the poem is a reference to the marriage of King Richard II to Anne of Bohemia which occurred in that year.[5]

This particular interpretation is the oldest and has certainly clung to life with more tenacity than any of the others, although very cogent arguments have been presented for other allegorical interpretations. The two most important are those of Haldeen Braddy[6] and Edith Rickert.[7] Braddy would claim a date of 1377 because, as he maintains, the poem refers to the potential marriage of Richard to Marie of France which, however, did not take place because of Marie's untimely death. This would fit in neatly with the undetermined alliance of the formel and tercel eagles, and Braddy makes the most of it. The date of 1377 would place the poem a couple of years before the usually assumed date for the *House of Fame* (ca. 1379) and would upset the generally-accepted order of the chronology of Chaucer's vision poems (and revert to the order which Skeat and many other scholars of the late nineteenth century preferred). The present essay will imply, among other things, that the *Parlement* is a later poem than the *House of Fame,* though the arguments must inevitably to an extent be circular.

Miss Rickert's interpretation is that the allegory is applicable to the engagement of John of Gaunt's eldest daughter and that Chaucer would naturally have written such a poem for an important social event in the life of his greatest patron. The formel eagle, then, would be Philippa, the suitors would be Richard II, William of Mainault and John of Blois. The satire, she explains, is against the peasants, which would be particularly pleasing to John of Gaunt, but, of course, since Richard put down the peasants' revolt, it would have been equally pleasing to him, and so 'round and 'round we go. Likewise, it is not clear that the satire is directed at the lower classes.[8]

In light of this seemingly never-to-be settled problem of historical allegory, it is obviously foolish to base any thorough-going interpretation of the poem itself upon such shaky foundation. But nevertheless let us keep in mind the fact that the allegorical correspondence to persons might well have existed, and make allowances for such an eventuality.

Thus far this study has considered only one kind of historical allegory. For some time now critics of the poem have been speculating about a number of wider, more general historical applications of the allegory that nearly all except Professor Manly[9] agree is lurking somewhere in the *Parlement of Foules*. In 1937 R. E. Thackabeery, capitalizing on the apparent draw to which critics had fought,[10] one group seeing in the *Parlement* a satire on the upper classes, another on the lower classes, very shrewdly suggested that Chaucer was satirizing both classes in a bit of moral and social allegory deploring the constant strife and confusion existing in the social order of his time. This interpretation of Chaucer's attitude as objective rather than biased, and which led to the interpretation of the poem as something of a human comedy, is reflected in the comments of Bronson and Clemen.

Another school of more abstract allegorists has arisen which sees in the *Parlement's* ironic juxtaposition of the preliminary reading of Cicero and the garden of love as symbolic of a dilemma in the Poet's mind between true and false felicity, or more simply, a dichotomy between man's duty in the world and his actual pursuits which, from a serious moral standpoint, are perhaps something less than ideal. R. C. Goffin[11] first formulated the statement of this position and Lumiansky elaborated considerably on the thesis.[12] This concept accounts satisfactorily for the inconclusive feeling of the poem, indicating the *impasse* in Chaucer's own mind. But it does not take into account the full significance of love in the poem (it is treated always as simply the case in point, whereas it would seem that the problem of love itself is a central one,[13] and more particularly does the problem of the love-Poet's function seem pressing to Chaucer). Further, both Goffin and Lumiansky fail to take sufficiently into account the deep vein of humor in the poem, thus leaving the *Parlement of Foules* precisely the *tractatus* that Lumiansky claims it is. They fail to grasp the central fact of Chaucer's art which is, that though he may sing of Heaven and Earth and Hell, his Muse is Thalia. The reader of Chaucer knows

that the poet can and does treat extremely serious problems in his poetry, as in the *Book of the Duchess* and the *House of Fame*. But this seriousness is seldom direct, pedagogical, or philosophical; the seriousness is inherent in his kind of humor and in the symbolic structure of his poetry.

While the essays of Goffin and Lumiansky are valuable for the light they throw on Chaucer's motives, the three best essays of a general nature which have been written, those of Bronson,[14] Clemen,[15] and Stillwell,[16] stress in common that important element which the more serious studies lack, which is that the poem is a human comedy. These studies are very valuable antidotes to the current trend of seeing Chaucer as a more naive and less gifted Dante.

Of the examinations of the *Parlement* in the past ten years, two are of particular interest to this study.[17] The first study is that of C. A. Owen, Jr.,[18] who undertakes a structural analysis of the poem in terms of the function of the Dreamer-Poet. He conceives of this function as three-fold: first, the Poet as Lover who desires in his dream a painless initiation into the mysteries of love; secondly, the Poet as Poet who by the intrusion of laughter into the vision framework ridicules the poetic convention he is using; and thirdly, the Poet as philosopher who, while celebrating St. Valentine's Day concludes that Man is not a slave to instinct but is "free to choose" common profit if he wishes (derived from the juxtaposition of the Ciceronian dream and the love-garden dream). Thus Owen sets up actually four levels of interpretation, the Dantean literal, allegorical, moral, and anagogical:

> Chaucer intends us to be amused by the simplicity of his persons, but he intends the amusement to be tempered by the vision of conflict and of the freedom to choose, which that simplicity finally and unwittingly presents. We can see in the poem, in addition to the probably topical references to the French Valentine tradition, an approximation of the four levels of medieval allegory. The literal is the simple story of

> the narrator's experience, the reading, the dream, and the unenlightened awaking. The allegorical is what this represents in the narrator's life, the victory of impulse and passion, frustrated though they be, over the idealism suggested by his reading. The moral level is represented by the implied criticism of the parliament in Scipio's "commune profyt" and the comment on the complicated pretentiousness of the nobler birds in the simple happiness of the matings and the roundel. The fourth level, the anagogical, is approached if not actually reached by the contrast between the two dreams in the poem and the freedom for man implied in this conditioned triumph of nature and instinct.[19]

Because this study's concern for the poem's structure will also lead to a consideration of the function of the Poet-Dreamer, this discussion will have a good deal to say about Owen's conclusions, rather more than the article itself warrants, for, of course, such a four-level reading of Chaucer is absurd.[20] For the present, however, only two comments on Owen's division of the Poet's functions are necessary. His first division, the Poet as lover who dreams the dream for his own satisfaction, "to be initiated painlessly into the mysteries of love," fails to make the point adequately clear that this function is purely as vehicle, a comic means of progression on a superficial level. Owen appears to take this function far more seriously than does Chaucer who constantly pokes fun at this figure of the Poet. The other observation is that Owen has seriously confused the second two functions. Chaucer has "ridiculed" the vision scheme before; the intrusion of reality into the framework of the dream poem has been seen in both poems previously discussed, and, as we have seen, this intrusion should not necessarily be taken as ridicule of the dream as a vehicle. Owen does well, though, to bring attention to the function of the Poet as Poet in the poem. What he has failed to perceive is that the function which he labels "Poet as philosopher" is really "Poet as Poet." For nowhere does Chaucer set up his Dreamer as

a philosopher or even as one concerned with philosophy; the Dreamer is looking for his solution, a way to "fare the bet" *as a Poet,*[21] and the reason is a very simple one. He is a Poet of love, and his concern for the "philosophy" in the poem, the philosophical problems revolving about love, is his concern for the materials of his craft. These points will be elaborated in further discussion.

Perhaps the better and more general of the two recent studies mentioned is the brief chapter in Derek Brewer's little book *Chaucer.*[22] Brewer sees the poem as Chaucer's presentation of the human comedy in which love (in a Boethian sense) is approved by Nature and enjoyed according to capacity by man mirrored in the body of fowls. But Chaucer the serious Poet remains puzzled as to the exact duty of man, and of the Poet, because, after all, there is still the *caveat* of Africanus, and in what sense is it to be taken? Because Brewer's commentary is probably the best explication yet offered of the basic conflicts which form one of the poem's themes, a few of his summarizing statements follow.

> We can now, however, at least see something of the terms of the problem. Just as the Temple of Venus represented lascivious love, so Nature represents legitimate love. The figure of Nature is the key to the latter part of the poem. She is God's deputy . . . . She knits together the diverse elements of the world by the bonds of Love, as Boethius explains in the *Consolation.* Nature here is the expression of God's creative activity. Whatever she ordains is good.[23]
>
> The poem thus presents first the major problem of the dualism of the world, then the subsidiary comment on the two kinds of love. We see these not in terms of logical conflict, but rather as masses of light and dark are balanced against each other in a picture.[24]
>
> What, however, is the total effect in the *Parliament?* Chaucer, like other medieval writers of debates, deliberately

> leaves the problem open — he is no propagandist. But the satirical humor of parts of the debate should not blind us to the genuine seriousness beneath. The strain between the two ways of life, the way of Acceptance, the way of Denial, he does not finally resolve till the end of his life, when, old and tired, he takes the way of Denial and condemns his non-religious writings. But in his fruitful period of manhood, conscious of and delighting in his powers and the richness of the world, he very strongly leans towards the way of Acceptance. Nature is good, and genuine love is good, since ordained by her — that is the overwhelming impression left by the *Parliament*.[25]

These excerpts admirably state what this study conceives to be one of the two main themes of the *Parlement of Foules*: the nature and function of love in a Boethian universe. The second theme, which has been alluded to earlier, is concurrent with the first, for it is the nature and function of the Poet, particularly the love-Poet. I have attempted to show elsewhere that this was, also, in part, the theme of the *House of Fame*,[26] except that in the *Parlement* Chaucer is more directly and pre-eminently concerned with love, whereas in the earlier poem love is basically a contributing, not a central, theme. In the *Parlement* the problem of the Poet is much more specific, though in its ramifications, i.e., the love-Poet's place in the "feyre cheyne" of love, it, too, is universal.

In the succeeding pages of this paper, Chaucer's development of these twin themes will be illustrated, not only as they appear in his explicit statements of the problems, but as the themes are adumbrated and elaborated symbolically in the imagery of the *Parlement of Foules* and alluded to by way of literary echoes and allusions.

The *Parlement of Foules* opens with a brief and somewhat abstract discussion of love, in its nature familiar to readers of the *Book of the Duchess* and the *House of Fame*. The *sententia* "The lyf so short, the craft so long to lerne,/Th' assay so hard, so sharp the

conquerynge," comprises the first two lines of the poem, and, if we are to trust the practice of medieval rhetoric, is in its nature an epigrammatic focusing and summarizing of certain ideas to be found in the poem. The craft he is speaking of, says the Narrator, is Love. This is certainly on the surface true. But it is also certain that the lines imply in addition the Poet's craft (which, of course, is intended by the original aphorism), the art of the Poet of love. If this be allowed, the Poet has in the first stanza of this relatively brief vision poem, consciously presented the double theme with which his work is concerned: the relation of divine love to the divine scheme and the function of the love Poet in relation to this order.

Following the *sententia* and its interpretation, the Poet goes on to a brief and thoroughly conventional description of the dualism of love, that of a wondrous God who is noted both for "myrakles" and "his crewel yre." All of which the Narrator, in the familiar pose with which we have become well acquainted, disclaims any direct knowledge. These two stanzas, then, sum up the conventional attitude of medieval love poets together with the conventional attitude of Chaucer's Narrator, both attitudes being important in their bearing on the rest of the poem, as we shall see. With these two stanzas, the first section of the poem, or as Lumiansky calls it, the "outside of the envelope," concludes. They have only an implied immediate connection to the discussion, upon which the Narrator next embarks:

> Of usage — what for lust and what for lore —
> On bokes rede I ofte, as I yow tolde.
> But wherfore that I speke al this? Nat yoore
> Agon, it happede me for to beholde
> Upon a bok, was write with lettres olde,
> And therupon, a certeyn thing to lerne,
> The longe day ful faste I redde and yerne. (11. 15-21)

The twofold purpose of his reading, "what for lust and what for lore," is reminiscent of the "lore" and "prow" which purposed his aerial journey in the *House of Fame*. But it is especially in relation

to the Poet's lore that he reads, hoping to find a "certeyn thing." The poet fails to reveal exactly what he is looking for, employing the *dubitatio* which activates the rest of the poem and which certainly creates sufficient interest if not suspense in the reader. It would appear nearly a certainty, however, that the "certeyn thing" has some relation to the twin theme implied in the *sententia* which opens the poem.

The book which the Narrator peruses is Macrobius' commentary on the *Somnium Scipionis,* a thorough neo-Platonizing of Cicero's Stoic tractate. To be brief, what the Poet learns here, via the advice of Africanus, who appears in the dream to Scipio, is that "he ne shulde hym in the world delyte" but "loke ay besyly . . . werche and wysse/To commune profit . . . ." The stoicism of the advice expressly warns against "likerousness" and delights of the flesh. The reward for those who "lovede commune profyt" is immortality in Heaven, and the punishment for those who eschew it, Hell.

According to Bronson, the Dreamer has stumbled onto the *Somnium* while searching for love material, and goes on reading because he has become fascinated by the dream, not for its relevance to his subject, but for its very irrelevance.[27] Thus the frame of the poem, with its juxtaposition of the *Somnium* to the vision of the Love-Garden, is basically ironic and the presence of Africanus as a guide to the Dreamer-Poet in the love vision sheds a "gentle irony" over the entire poem. The ironic fact is, indisputably, a fact, but Bronson's analysis of its purpose is, at least, only a partially satisfactory one. The preliminary reading serves a number of purposes. For one thing, it is a literary allusion, harking to the first few lines of the *Roman de la Rose* where "Macrobe" is referred to, thus giving Chaucer valuable literary precedence for his organization. For another, it, in introducing the concept of "commune profyt," would bring up a point which would certainly concern a poet of Chaucer's calibre, i.e., the question of what does the poet contribute to common profit, which is a moral as well as aesthetic question . . . in other words, a presentation in dif-

ferent terms of the problem with which we found Chaucer concerned in the *House of Fame*. Closely allied is the problem of the rightful place of earthly love — the material of the love-Poet — which is also propounded by the reading from Cicero and Macrobius. So, then, we shall see, if these conclusions can be further demonstrated, that there are three very definite relevancies of the introduction to the rest of the *Parlement of Foules*. But we must likewise keep in mind the shrewd conclusions of Bronson as to the humorous tone of this introduction and, in particular, the Poet's consciousness of the apparent incongruity involved.

But this is not all of the purpose of the reading from Cicero. For still another thing, the poet's abstract of the *Somnium* contains a backdrop against which the love vision is thrown into relief, the same sort of backdrop, we recall, that Chaucer used in the *House of Fame*:

> Thanne shewede he hym the lytel erthe that here is,
> At regard of the hevenes quantite;
> And after shewede he hym the hyne speres,
> And after that the melodye herde he
> That cometh of thilke speres thryes thre,
> That welle is of musik and melodye
> In this world here, and cause of armonye. (11. 57-63)
>
> Thanne tolde he hym, in certeyn yeres space
> That every sterre shulde come into his place
> Ther it was first, and al shulde out of mynde
> That in this world is don of al mankynde. (11. 67-70)

Here is the medieval Christian's concept of world order and unity, drawn from Boethius and fused as well into the description of Africanus. This background of universality will be augmented to a considerable extent by Chaucer later in the poem, lending emphasis to the Poet's universalizing the garden of love and the petty squabbles in the birds' parliament.

And then, of course, still another reason, and by far the weakest,

occasions the preliminary reading, that being the convention involved with which Chaucer of course was familiar, and which he had employed in the *Book of the Duchess* and by implication in the *House of Fame.*

This second section of the poem is concluded by the following stanza:

> The day gan faylen, and the derke nyght,
> That reveth bestes from here besynesse,
> Berafte me my bok for lak of lyght,
> And to my bed I gan me for to dresse,
> Fulfyld of thought and busy hevynesse;
> For bothe I hadde thyng which that I nolde,
> And ek I nadde that thyng that I wolde. (11. 85-91)

This stanza has propounded many of the questions which puzzle critics of the poem. Just what has the poet learned from the reading that he didn't want to learn? And what was he looking for that he has failed to find? Lumiansky says, "Let us assume that the certain thing Chaucer sought in Macrobius means, as Goffin urged, a way to reconcile true and false felicity."[28] Stillwell's retort, that the assumption "is a large and very specific one indeed,"[29] aptly states what is apparently the general reaction to the propositions of Goffin and Lumiansky. However, the business of true and false felicity is, indeed, a generalization of the moral polarities of the Boethian Nature-Venus and the Venus of *amor courtois,* between good love and corrupted love, which Brewer reasonably formulates. Although these suggestions omit the social implications argued by Stillwell and Thackabeery as well as the aspects of human comedy insisted upon by Bronson and Clemen, they certainly are not necessarily in opposition to them.

To come to any conclusion about what the Poet was looking for, we have to return to his opening statement: "Of usage—what for lust and what for lore—/On bokes rede I ofte, as I yow tolde." (11. 15-16) That is, he reads for pleasure and also to enrich his mind. We must have foremost in our minds that the reader is a

Poet, and as a Poet, his mind is constantly in search for raw materials which the poetic catalyst can transform. What he has come across is a moral treatise — the *Somnium* with its commentary by Macrobius. Now, as Bronson noted, this is not exactly the sort of thing one would normally expect a Poet of love, as Chaucer always professes himself to be, to pick up and read with interest. But the Poet expressly does so, perhaps recalling the reference to Macrobius at the beginning of the *Roman,* "a certeyn thing to lerne." What certain thing could a Poet expect to learn in a moral treatise such as the *Somnium?* Surely it is not too great an assumption to think that a Poet will usually read new materials with an eye to their service to him as raw materials or otherwise. At any rate, the proof of this particular pudding is readily seen in the eating, for the Poet does make use of his reading and quite directly: "For bothe I hadd thyng which that I nolde,/And ek I nadde that thyng that I wolde."

The Poet has, then, got at least two things from his reading. Cannot this be rather readily examined by seeing just what the Poet tells us of his reading? The things he learns are quite explicit:

> . . . Know thyself first immortal,
> And loke ay besyly thow werche and wysse
> To commune profit, and thow shalt not mysse
> To comen swiftly to that place deere
> That ful of blysse is and of soules cleere. (11. 73-77)

Likewise Africanus issues a warning against "likerous" folk, threatening them with the fate of Paolo and Francesca. The first thing, that he should know himself immortal, was simply what any Christian should have known, so we may safely dismiss this as something the Poet learned that he did not know. The necessity of working for common profit and of eschewing earthly love remains as the thing that he "nolde." Now comes the difficulty. Obviously the Poet did not want to learn that one must eschew earthly love in order to achieve Heaven, for that would strike at the love-Poet's function. This would also, by implication, include the Poet's un-

willingness to accept Africanus' definition of common profit, for such a concept, in light of Africanus' views on love, would find the Poet contributing nothing to the common good, rather, damaging it. If this is not what he did want, may we not assume that he sought the contrary? We have seen how Chaucer has been concerned with a justification for the Poet, and it would not be illogical for the Narrator to read "faste" and "yerne" in hopes of finding, in a moral treatise, just some such justification? Instead, he finds, by implication, the opposite. This would, indeed, leave the Poet "Fulfyld of thought and busy hevynesse."

The ostensible purpose of the *Parlement of Foules* is recognized, without question, by most commentators as a St. Valentine's Day poem in celebration of Love. What better such poem could Chaucer write than one justifying love and, by implication, the writer of such a poem? And how better could the justification be presented than as a commentary on a typical stoic denunciation of love? And how more ironical and suitable could the answer be than in the form of the established vision framework with Africanus himself as a guide in the journey through the Garden of Love? Seen in this light, the *Parlement of Foules* becomes as much a work of genius in design as it is, by common consent, in execution. Further, the work as executed, though perhaps not entirely by intention, becomes universalized as do most poems by creative genius; it expands, encompassing social satire and commentary upon humanity in general. And, resting atop this imposing structure, may well be, as many have argued, a polite compliment to a royal or noble couple!

This is, then, in part, the impetus provided by the preliminary reading of Cicero.

The final stanza of the second section of the poem (11. 85-91), which has already been quoted, contains, interestingly enough, two imitations, one, roughly the first two-thirds of the stanza, imitated from Dante (*Inferno* II, 1 ff.) and the second, comprising the last two lines, from Boethius (*Consolation*, III, *prosa* 3). These come to

the poem naturally, and without any pretentiousness. They fit the purpose and mood of the stanza beautifully, catching up at once the sense of Dante's twilight mood:

> Lo giorno se n'andava, e l'aer bruno
> toglieva gli animai, che sono in terra,
> dalle fatiche loro; ed io sol uno
>
> m'apparecchiava a sostener la guerra
> si del cammino, e si della pietate,
> che ritrarra la mente, che non erra.

and the patient resignation of Boethius' lament. It is curious that once again, as in the *House of Fame,* Chaucer freely uses significant allusions to and quotations from these masters. Could it be that once again he is dealing with much the same theme that he pursued in the *House of Fame* and that these two great informing sources of his thought once again symbolize the clash of medieval Platonism and Aristotelianism in their concepts of love as well as of poetry? For, as we have seen, the undercurrents of Boethius (opposing the Muses as a moral force) and of Dante (extolling the Christian Poet and his function) have the effect of reflecting or catching as in an echo the confused and undecided thought of Chaucer on the value of his avocation in the medieval Christian scheme of things. The pronounced influence of Boccaccio throughout the poem contributes perhaps to this "debate" between the sharply divided attitudes within Chaucer. Very likely, not far in the background of his reading prior to writing the *Parlement* are the concluding books of Boccaccio's *De Genealogia Deorum* in which Boccaccio expounds upon the function of the poet in society. But primarily we have Boethius and Dante — these two germinal forces of his thought representing divided medieval attitudes toward love. Boethius' urging man to eschew that which is ephemeral (his fair chain of love which binds the universe is the love of God, though it extends to human, productive love, the idea of Nature, perhaps) and Dante's elevating the idealism of courtly love to the gates of Paradise. It is altogether

fitting that they should appear juxtaposed in the same stanza following one of the more eloquent denunciations of human love, mirroring the confusion in Chaucer's mind and his concern for the twin themes of the poem, the place of love in the universal plan, and the place of the Poet, particularly the love-Poet. It seems that the two imitations derive organically from Chaucer's concern for the problem; it is not, certainly, to say that Chaucer carefully and consciously picked these adaptations as if to say, "Aha! That sums it up!" But the effect is such a beautiful dove-tailing of ideas that he might well have.

Beginning the dream proper, the Poet relates how Africanus appeared to him as he had done to Scipio. The Narrator apparently feels some necessity to explain this phenomenon, so he borrows from Claudian a passage which explains the matter in some detail:

> The wery huntere, slepynge in his bed,
> To wode ayeyn his mynde goth anon;
> The juge dremeth how his plees been sped;
> The cartere dremeth how his cartes gon;
> The riche, of gold; the knyght fyght with his fon;
> The syke met he drynketh of the tonne;
> The lovere met he hath his lady wonne. (11. 99-105)

Further, Africanus, as if realizing a strangeness in his presence in the Poet's dream, carefully explains to him his reasons:

> But thus seyde he, "Thow has the so wel born
> In lokynge of myn old bok totorn,
> Of which Macrobye roughte nat a lyte,
> That sumdel of thy labour wolde I quyte." (11. 109-112)

This sounds suspiciously like the eagle's accounting for himself to the Poet in the *House of Fame*. The Poet has labored and is to be rewarded, specifically, as Africanus states later, by being shown "mater of to wryte."

Africanus, then, is going to reward the Poet for reading his book, perhaps with the answer to the questions that were pressing upon the

Poet, the "certeyn thing" which the Poet wanted to learn, but could not discover from the book.

But that the narrative should not get too far from the main path, Chaucer inserts here an invocation to Cytherea, who "madest me this sweven for to mete." Venus is, after all, the governing force of the poem; it is in her honor that the St. Valentine's Day vision poem is being written. But Chaucer is more specific than this; Venus is not only responsible for the poem generally, but for the dream itself. It does not seem at all likely that the invocation is a part of a later revision, nor is it an excrescence on the poem;[30] if it were not a part of the original scheme, it should have been, for it is needed to avoid confusion. Further, the invocation to Cytherea adds emphasis to what have been described as the twin themes of the poem; she is, of course, the goddess of love and as such controls the scope of the love-Poet's activity. Also, Venus was in the Middle Ages associated with rhetoric and considered the patroness of that art; the distance from rhetoric to poetry being quite short in the Middle Ages, it does not seem too unlikely that Chaucer, as a Poet and a Poet of love, could have seen a double function and appropriateness in his calling for the assistance of Cytherea, the heavenly body overlooking his labors.

But back to the question of the relation of the invocation to the role of Africanus in the dream. Since Venus "madest me this sweven for to mete," she must, in the eyes of the Dreamer, have been responsible also for the appearance of Africanus, and, thus, for the original search that led deep into his book, for that "certeyn thing." Professor Bronson perceptively points out the broad irony involved in having Africanus himself, the old stoic, lead the poet through a garden of medieval courtly love. But, it does not seem that the irony sufficiently justifies itself as irony; in other words, it is not Chaucer's custom to deliver himself of an ironic *tour de force* without some broader, deeper meaning involved beneath the irony itself. Basically, as Brewer maintains, the juxtaposition throws into relief two ways of life, the

way of Denial, represented by Africanus, and the way of Acceptance, the way of love, of the full life, represented by Nature.

If, as has been suggested earlier in this essay, the poem is designed as a justification of love and, by implication, of the love-Poet, things come into a clearer focus. If we consider that Cytherea has caused this dream in order to reveal to the Dreamer-Poet the great scope of her power, we realize that she is, in her broader powers, Nature herself. Cytherea is here obviously not considered as equivalent to that langorous Venus who appears in the courtly garden; Cytherea is the planet, the Greater Venus, the Sixth Daughter of the Sky and the Day, whose love on an earthly level is part of that fair chain that binds Boethius' universe.[31] She is related only by extremity to the lascivious mother of Cupid who appears in the Temple of Love.

Considering this view of Venus, the Cytherea who commands the allegiance of every true Poet, it is not inexplicable that old Africanus is chosen to guide the Poet into the Garden of Love in which, presumably, if all goes well, love is to be justified morally and philosophically. The choice is, of course, ironic; Africanus is to show the garden in much the same way as he showed the universe and the harmony of the spheres to Scipio. May we not assume that the implications are roughly parallel? That the love garden is a microcosm, man's earthly garden, the community to the profit of which every man is expected to contribute? But this we shall pursue at greater length.

The stanza following the invocation brings Africanus and the Dreamer-Poet to the celebrated gate of the park which is walled with "grene ston." Because it will be necessary to make some comments on the wonderful inscriptions of the gate, these two stanzas will be quoted in full:

> "Thorgh me men gon into that blysful place
> Of hertes hele and dedly woundes cure;
> Thorgh me men gon unto the welle of grace,
> There grene and lusty May shal evere endure.
> This is the wey to al good aventure.

Be glad, thow redere, and thy sorwe of caste;
Al open am I—passe in, and sped thee faste!"

"Thorgh me men gon," than spak that other side,
"Unto the mortal strokes of the spere
Of which Disdayn and Daunger is the gyde,
Ther nevere tre shal fruyt ne leves bere.
This strem yow ledeth to the sorweful were
There as the fish in prysoun is al drye;
Th' eschewing is only the remedye!" (11. 127-140)

Now, of course, it is obvious that the sentiments of both these stanzas are conventional wordings of the courtly language of love, praising and blaming the god of "myrakles" and "cruel yre." They are ironically appropriate as Dantesque introductions to the Garden of Love. But they are appropriate as well in the broader sense of the love theme as this study has defined it. The two inscriptions represent, then, the way of Acceptance and the way of Denial ("Th' eschewing is only the remedye!"). The Poet is bewildered, unable to make the decision to enter:

Right as, betwixen adamauntes two
Of evene myght, a pece of yren set
Ne hath no myght to meve to ne fro —
For what that oon may hale, that other let —
Ferde I, that nyste whether me was bet
To entre or leve, til Affrycan, my gide,
Me hente, and shof in at the gates wide . . . (11. 148-154)

This inability to come to a decision symbolizes generally the dilemma facing the thoughtful Christian and would particularly symbolize the dilemma facing the medieval love-Poet who was too much of a realist to follow Dante's path of idealism. But literally, of course, we have once again Chaucer's hesitant, timid Narrator dismayed in part by his sense of inadequacy. Africanus, seeing the cause, upbraids the Narrator for his temerity in hesitating, for the sign does not even apply to him — but only to him "who Loves servaunt be."

Again Chaucer's Narrator is in character: he sees, reports experience, he is the Poet — but he stands outside experience. This is, as we have seen in the earlier studies, a humorous device by the oral artist to achieve irony — either irony by contrast or by representation of reality only too clearly — which, we have no way of knowing. But always, in jest or seriousness, the Narrator is the Poet, and Africanus regards his own function as that of providing materials for the Poet! "And if thow haddest connyng for t'endite/I shal the shewe mater of to wryte."

Then Chaucer launches into the description of the garden, humorously introduced by the Poet's being shoved through the gate. The garden, we learn through the descriptive catalogues, is a conventional love-garden — with a significant difference.

The first thing that strikes the reader upon entering with the Narrator into this eternally May garden is the all-pervading greenness:

> For overal where that I myne eyen caste
> Were trees clad with leves that ay shal laste,
> Ech in his kynde, of colour fresh and greene
> As emeraude, that joye was to seene. (11. 172-175)

This color has been mentioned before, we recall: "Ryght of a park walled with grene ston," and "There grene and lusty May shal evere endure." Now, of course, there is nothing startling about a garden's being green, together with its surroundings. But the greenness is a part of the broad significance of the garden itself, that is, life, "lustyhed," productiveness generally. Its conventionality does not destroy its function; rather, in this instance, it would seem to tend to increase the significance of the function. The greenness or fruitfulness has application in two different directions; it is a part of the picture of Nature, sovereign of true love, and is symbolic of love generally as it has always been. Secondly, it has implied significance in the general problem of the productiveness of the Poet in this world-garden of life.

Chaucer's description of the Garden of Love has struck several critics of the poem as being a microcosmic figuration of the world and of man's life. This it is. Much of the Poet's description of the garden is utterly conventional, but it has been noted that the oft-criticized catalogue of trees in the midst of its outward conventionality (a standard rhetorical landscape topic treated by medieval rhetoricians) in a remarkable way illuminates the fact that the garden serves as a microcosmic symbol. For the trees are not just trees, idle objects enumerated to fill in the details of the Poet's canvas; they are significantly described in their relation to man, and the realism derived therefrom adumbrates the Chaucerian "naturalness" of the climactic parliament itself. Let us look at this stanza for a moment:

> The byldere ok, and ek the hardy asshe;
> The piler elm, the cofre unto carayne;
> The boxtre pipere, holm to whippes lashe;
> The saylynge fyr; the cipresse, deth to playne;
> The shetere ew; the asp for shaftes pleyne;
> The olyve of pes, and eke the dronke vyne;
> The victor palm, the laurer to devyne. (11. 176-182)

Each tree is accompanied with an epithet describing in a word or so its function in the life of man; in other words, man's activity is epitomized in a catalogue of trees. In the borrowed catalogue there are the usual olive of peace and victory palm and the laurel, the "piler elm, the cofre unto carayne" and the "shetere ew." Chaucer does the same thing essentially in the description of the Parliament itself.

The next several stanzas concern themselves with purely traditional descriptions of the medieval Garden of Love. Surrounded by the various allegorical personifications of medieval romance, including Cupid beneath a tree, the Poet sees a temple of brass. Before the temple the Poet sees Dame "Pes" with a "curtyn," and Dame Patience sitting on a hill of sand, apparently symbolizing the unstable foundation of a life devoted to the fleshly Venus. About the temple danced

"women inowe" in disheveled attire, appropriately adumbrating the appearance of the lewd Priapus. Inside the temple are Priapus and Venus herself, both of whom are described at some length. Priapus is presented in the following terms:

> The god Priapus saw I, as I wente,
> Withinne the temple in sovereyn place stonde,
> In swich aray as whan the asse hym shente
> With cri by nighte, and with hys sceptre in honde.
> Ful besyly men gonne assaye and fonde
> Upon his hed to sette, of sondry hewe,
> Garlondes ful of freshe floures newe. (11. 253-259)

In other words, in the midst of the idealistic convention, at the heart of it so to speak, the God of Lust is a governing force. This is, of course, the aspect of courtly love which had bewildered medieval writers, causing the recantation of Andreas the archpriest of courtly love, as well, in part, as the retraction of Chaucer himself. There follows the description of the earthly Venus and of her attendants. It was long ago pointed out that Chaucer somewhat tarnishes the glowing picture of Venus found in his sources. Chaucer nowhere in his works is an enthusiastic glorifier of Venus. Although he devotes two stanzas to her and three more to her followers, and these occupy fully one third of the garden passage, let us note that this section serves simply as a prologue to the climax of the poem, the appearance of Nature in the garden, and the subsequent debate. Let it suffice to say simply that Chaucer suppressed Venus, the mother of Cupid, because it is his purpose to emphasize and glorify the Greater Venus, or rather, the entire concept of earthly love, of which Cupid's dam is only one element. This is simply another argument for the existence in Chaucer's design, probably derived from *De Genealogie Deorum*, of two different Venuses, for it would be singularly incongruous for the Poet to slight the mother of Cupid if she, in fact, had caused the dream in the first place. But if one considers the Cytherea of the invocation to be the greater Venus, the incongruity vanishes.

Further, the contrast between the "Cypride" and the Natural patterns of love is emphasized by a sort of Brooksian "light-dark" opposition of the imagery in the descriptions. For Venus, as the Poet tells us, resides "in a prive corner" and "Derk was that place." Further, we remember, Dame "Pes" sat before the temple with a "curtyn" in her hands. In contrast with this we find "this noble goddesse Nature" residing "in a launde, upon a hil of floures."

But one thing must here be kept clearly in mind, and that is Chaucer in describing the Garden of Love presided over by Venus is not necessarily critical of courtly love *per se*. Its trappings are those of the court of love, but the lewdness explicit in the Poet's description attacks the excesses of and the hypocrisy in courtly love as usually practiced, that is, the unproductive and immoral adultery; the idealism of courtly love as a basis of a marriage of "gentilesse" is, of course, important in the scheme of the debate, and the opinion of critics generally is that under the auspices of Nature this concept of courtly love is no more being satirized than is any other species of love, all of which are presented wtih gentle irony.

But the journey through the garden is, first of all, an investigation of the nature of love; the love represented by Priapus is a part of the whole and so is included. Cytherea, the Greater Venus, is hiding nothing; her purpose, apparently, is to justify the greater good notwithstanding the lesser evil.

Following a brief catalogue of those unfortunates who "dyde" for love (i.e., the variety of love he has just described), the Poet moves on "myselven to solace," obviously troubled even further by what he has just seen. He then comes to an open place where resides a queen who surpasses by far any other creature he has ever seen. This is, of course, Nature, but this sort of description is usually reserved for Venus. It seems excusable, then, to make again the suggestion that perhaps Nature is here at least partially equated with the Greater Venus in what she, as Nature, is represented as doing —binding the universe as Boethian Love. She is here sanctioning

and assisting human or earthly love as a part of the higher love which moves the spheres in harmony.

The subsequent catalogue of birds, suggested as the Poet acknowledges, by Alain de Lille, emphasizes the wide scope of the garden; it is, indeed, under the guise of a parliament of birds, a universalized depiction of humanity. Whether the classes are so ordered and enumerated as Miss Rickert and others have thought, is of little importance; that the basic allegorical fact has been perceived by most of the poem's critics is all that is needed for our discussion. Lines 323-371 are a perhaps too lengthy and detailed description of the various birds, and, although they contain some very fine poetry occasionally, they would not repay elaborate comment, so we will go directly to the commencement of the debate itself.

> But to the poynt: Nature held on hire hond
> A formel egle, of shap the gentilleste
> That evere she among hire werkes fond,
> The moste benygne and the goodlieste.
> In hire was everi vertu at his reste,
> So ferforth that Nature hireself hadde blysse
> To loke on hire, and ofte hire bek to kysse. (11. 372-378)

Nature, the "vicaire of the almyghty lord," then proceeds to announce the occasion of the gathering, and, in particular, to present the formel eagle to the suitors, actually to the chief suitor, the tercel eagle who first appears and who begins the courtly avowal. Nature sees the match between the formel and the first tercel, the royal fowl, as the more fitting and "natural," and implies to the formel that he is her best choice. But Nature also recognizes the principle of individual choice and makes it clear that the final word is that of the formel herself, as, indeed, it is with all the chosen birds; "This is oure usage alwey, fro yer to yeere," says the goddess. Concerning this passage, Professor Owen certainly has a point when he remarks that it perhaps represents the Poet's conclusion that the individual has ultimately free choice between the way of Acceptance and the

way of Denial, that the poem is not deterministic, that men are not compelled by their natures to live lives of selfish indulgence.

The first tercel makes his bid, but we are surprised to find another and still another tercel in the field. The quick and easy choice that Nature foresaw has been thwarted. Though the royal tercel's personal superiorities are recognized, at least implicitly, by the other two tercels in that whereas they do not dispute Nature's evaluation, they maintain their suits on the strengh of their love and service. This is an extremely important passage in the poem, which has been unduly neglected. The notion that the two inferior tercels are in reality rivals of Richard for the hand of Anne may be correct (however unflattering to Richard since the formel is unable to, or at least does not, choose among them!). But the real significance of the impasse, and the significance of the general debate on the subject, is in the universal power of love which recognizes no social barriers;[32] Love is the common denominator of the parliament; the merits of the three suitors must be balanced out in the scales of love. Nature, though recognizing the superiority of the first tercel, realizes well the necessity of the choice's being made on the basis of love alone. The tercels compete for the formel on the basis of their love only, not their social position. This perhaps accounts for the symbolic refusal of the formel to choose among them.

The first tercel states his case thus:

"And syn that non loveth hire so wel as I,
Al be she nevere of love me behette,
Thanne oughte she be myn thourgh hire mercy,
For other bond can I non on hire knette." (11. 435-438)

The second:

"And if she shulde have loved for long lovynge,
To me ful-longe hadde be the guerdonynge." (11. 454-455)

And the third:

"But I dar seyn, I am hire treweste man
As to my dom, and faynest wolde hire ese." (11. 479-480)

These speeches initiate what is in a sense a *dubitatio,* creating the need for a decision and postponing that decision by the subsequent debate. Everything here is beautifully motivated; the speeches are idealistic in the best vein of courtly love, but they are not being made by fools. Each, to an extent, is realistic; the speaker recognizes in each case the practical matters involved, that is, that nothing matters without her consent. And, further, the third speaker, while determined, is quite realistically aware of the annoying effect that the debate he is helping to prolong is having on the other birds, assembled and impatient to choose their mates. The ironic effect inherent in the predicament of courtly love thus seems to be recognized by the participants, particularly by the third, whose speech rings with the dogged determination of an orator last on the program of a political convention:

> "Now sires, ye seen the lytel leyser heere;
> For every foul cryeth out to ben ago
> Forth with his make, or with his lady deere;
> And ek Nature hireself ne wol not here,
> For taryinge here, not half that I wolde seye,
> And but I speke, I mot for sorwe deye." (11. 464-469)

And, so, to some extent, those who argue that Chaucer is satirizing the courtly code of conduct here are quite right. But they fail to realize that the treatment accorded the courtly lovers is gently satiric, and is of the same variety of gentle irony that Chaucer casts over the entire picture of the squabbling birds.

The Poet's own reaction to the initial statements of the tercels is typically that of Chaucer's Narrator. He reports, and is, as usual, full of admiration:

> Of al my lyf, syn that day I was born,
> So gentil ple in love or other thyng
> Ne herde nevere no man me beforn, . . . (11. 484-486)

Directly juxtaposed to this admiring report, however, we have the reaction of the parliament itself which breaks into the speeches which,

says the Narrator, continue to the setting of sun. "The noyse of foules for to ben delyvered/ So loude rong, 'Have don, and lat us wende!'" (11. 491-492)

Nature quickly restores order and casts around for a way out of the confusion. She decides to let the birds choose an arbiter who will in turn choose a method of settlement. The fowls of ravine elect the first tercel who slyly suggests that the only way of avoiding out-and-out combat on the issue is to let the formel choose the most eligible suitor from the point of view of qualifications, and who this will be, says the tercel, "it is lite to knowe."

The parliament of birds takes over the discussion in a full-scale debate. The problem of love centered in the triangle is then reflected against the varying scale of human opinion and practice, setting courtly love in its proper place against the background of all classes of English civilization. In the course of this, Chaucer's satire flicks at all types of humanity, and, further, the subject no longer is courtly love but love in general, sufficiently justifying the title of the poem in several manuscripts, "The Parlement of Foules Reducyd to Love."

The rich imagery employed by Chaucer during the course of this brief but lively debate reinforces and emphasizes the comprehensiveness and universality of the world figured in this microcosm of the debating parliament.[33] The duck, the goose, the cuckoo, the turtle dove, the merlin, all argue back and forth, the charges growing louder and the participants becoming more and more indignant. The general disorder of the debate may well justify such observations as those by Stillwell and others who see the disorder as Chaucer's satirizing society for failure to work together in harmony. However, such an implication would not seem to be Chaucer's chief intention. More than likely it is intended to represent the scale of human attitudes toward love.

After most of the varying points of view have been expounded, Nature calls a halt to the proceedings, seeing that nothing is going to come from further discussion. She then re-states, and with more

pertinence this time, her previous declaration that the final choice must rest with the formel herself. Again, however, Nature puts in a "plug" for the royal tercel:

> "But as for conseyl for to chese a make,
> If I were Resoun, certes, thanne wolde I
> Conseyle yow the royal tercel take,
> As seyde the tercelet ful skylfully . . ." (11. 631-634)

The formel, who had earlier exhibited bashfulness and some reluctance, takes full advantage of this out offered, and asks a respite of a year. "I wol nat serve Venus ne Cupide,/ Forsothe as yit, by no manere weye." (11. 632-633) Nature accepts the decision and advises the tercels to bear their disappointment in good part and persevere in their service:

> And whan this werk al brought was to an ende,
> To every foul Nature yaf his make
> By evene acord, and on here way they wende.
> And, Lord, the blisse and joye that they make!
> For ech of hem gan other in wynges take,
> And with here nekkes ech gan other wynde,
> Thankynge alwey the noble goddesse of kynde.
> (11. 666-672)

Before the fowls leave, however, they sing a customary roundel in gratitude for the bliss that Nature has given them.

> "Now welcome, somer, with thy sonne softe,
> That hast this wintres wedres overshake,
> And driven away the longe nyghtes blake!
> Saynt Valentyn, that art ful hy on-lofte,
> Thus syngen smale foules for thy sake:
> Now welcome, somer, with thy sonne softe,
> That hast this wintres wedres overshake.
> Wel han they cause for to gladen ofte,
> Sith ech of him recovered hath hys make,
> Ful blissful mowe they synge when they wake.

Now welcome, somer, with thy sonne softe,
That hast this wintres wedres overshake,
And driven away the longe nyghtes blake!" (11. 679-692)

This roundel, in the French manner as the Poet ingenuously claims, is a high point in the poem, acclaiming love as a regenerative, creative, universalizing, equalizing, liberating, harmonizing force. It is, in effect, the climax of the poem, the triumphant conclusion of the vision sent by Cytherea to justify earthly love. The picture has been full-scale; the artificiality and voluptuousness of courtly love excesses, the lewd prurience, are not slighted, but are treated as peripheral to the domain of Nature who is, in respect of love, the Greater Venus, all-pervading and all-informing. The roundel declares lyrically that love is basically good. As Brewer comments, "Nature is good, and genuine love is good, since ordained by her — that is the overwhelming impression left by the *Parliament*."[34] And, by implication, since the final justification of love (in the dream, however, be it noted) is in the form of a poetic manifesto, the roundel, it would seem that the Poet's two-fold quest has been rewarded to his satisfaction.

But, this is a dream. And the Poet must awaken to reality, and with reality returns the disturbing concern for a problem that has not been fully solved by Cytherea's dream. The Poet must continue to muse and speculate. And so the Poet does: "I wok, and others bokes tok me to/ To reede upon, and yit I rede alwey./ I hope, ywis, to rede so som day/ That I shal mete som thyng for to fare/ The bet, and thus to rede I nyl nat spare." (11. 695-699)

By way of summary, let us examine some of the problems we have traced through the poem. The Poet writes an occasional love vision for St. Valentine's Day. It revolves, then, quite naturally, about two themes, the nature and justification of love, and, consequently, of the justification of the love-Poet. Since the question is, to an extent, a philosophical one, Chaucer uses, for the conventional book introduction, a philosophical treatise dealing with the problem from a typically medieval point of view. The purpose of this is both for

irony and contrast. The answer that the Poet finds in the *Somnium* itself is, of course, unsatisfactory. His reading and thinking on the subject cause Cytherea to grant him a dream in which the problems are to be resolved. As they are to be resolved (again, to an extent) in philosophical terms, and as the Poet has just read of Africanus, the elder Scipio himself is ironically elected to lead the Poet to the gates of the resolution. Love, in terms of the garden, is presented to the Poet against a backdrop of universalized human experience. It is presented in all its colors, in the stylized adultery of courtly love, as wantonness, as married love sanctioned by Nature-Venus (where there are, of course, many varieties, among them courtly love in an ideal sense), ranging through many degrees to the selfishness of the cuckoos. The burden of the dream is the justification of love by Nature, God's vicar, as the basic fact of existence. This would also, of course, justify the Poet who sings of love. This is the solution that the Poet would wish and one which he would like very much to believe; but, on waking, the Poet once again finds himself, like every medieval Christian, between the horns of his dilemma. There is the fact that Christianized Platonists like Macrobius, backed by much tradition, demanded that man eschew earthly love; what is the love-Poet to do? Even Boethius, while singing of the universal love, has Lady Philosophy require man to eschew love. The dilemma is represented in the Poet's avocation itself, as has been shown in discussing the contrast between Boethian and Dantean elements in the poem, Boethius execrating the Muse of Poetry, and Dante elevating the Poet to the highest.

Those who have seen the *Parlement of Foules* as a direct influence on Chaucer's subsequent struggles and reconciliation of these conflicting elements in *Troilus and Criseyde* and the *Knight's Tale* are, I believe, quite correct. And the Poet, although he is far from resolved in his own mind, has reached a synthesis, in which the Dantean concept of the Poet is transposed into a Boethian frame of universal harmony, which serves him, with few alterations, for the rest of his

poetic career — until the Retraction at the end of the *Canterbury Tales*.

FOOTNOTES

[1]*Geoffrey Chaucer* (Oxford, 1934), p. 118.

[2]For a modern example of this view, see J. S. P. Tatlock, *The Mind and Art of Chaucer* (Syracuse, N. Y., 1950), p. 66.

[3]*Chaucer* (London, 1952), p. 44.

[4]Though B. H. Bronson, "The *Parlement of Foules* Revisited," *ELH*, XV (1948), 247-259, argues convincingly that there is really no basis for such a specific date.

[5]This theory has been called "the Koch-Emerson theory." The principal sources are: J. Koch, "The Date and Personages of the *Parlement of Foules*," *Essays on Chaucer, Chaucer Society*, 2nd ser., 4, 1877, and *The Chronology of Chaucer's Writings, Chaucer Society*, 2nd ser., 27, 1890; O. F. Emerson, "The Suitors in Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules*," *MP*, VII (1910), 45-62, "The Suitors in the *Parlement of Foules* Again," *MLN*, XXI (1911), 109-111, and "What Is the *Parlement of Foules?*" *JEGP*, XIII (1914), 546-582. In addition, May E. Reid in her "The Historical Interpretation of *The Parlement of Foules*," *University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature*, XVIII (1924), 60-70, generally supports this theory, as does T. O. Wayland, "What Is *The Parlement of Foules?*" *MLN*, XLIII (1928), 378-384.

[6]"The *Parlement of Foules* in Its Relation to Contemporary Events," in *Three Chaucer Studies*, ed. Carleton Brown (New York, 1932). His contentions were elaborated in his book *Chaucer and the French Poet Graunson* (Baton Rouge, La., 1947).

[7]"A New Interpretation of the *Parlement of Foules*," *MP*, XVIII (1920), 1-29.

[8]For example, D. Patrick, "The Satire in Chaucer's *Parlement of Birds*," *PQ*, IX (1930), 61-65, thinks that it is directed against the upper classes.

[9]"What Is the *Parlement of Foules?*" *Studien zur englischen Philologie*, L (1913), 279-290, claims it is simply a conventional love debate. D. Brewer, however, in a recent article, shows that the *Parlement* differs from the conventional love debate in more ways than it resembles it ("The Genre of the *Parlement of Foules*," *MLR*, LIII (1958), 321-326).

[10]"Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules*," unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1937.

[11]"Heaven and Earth in the *Parlement of Foules*," *MLR*, XXXI (1936), 493-497.

[12]"Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules*: A Philosophical Interpretation," *RES*, XXIX (1948), 82-89.

[13]D. Betherum, "The Center of the *Parlement of Foules*," *Essays in Honor of Walter Clyde Curry* (Nashville, Tenn., 1954), pp. 39-50, has this as a main argument.

[14]"In Appreciation of Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules*," *University of California Publications in English*, III (1936), 193-224.

[15]*Der junge Chaucer* (Koln, 1938), pp. 115-183.

[16]G. H. Stillwell, "Unity and Comedy in the *Parlement of Foules*," *JEGP*, XLIX (1950), 470-495.

[17]Several studies have appeared on the *Parlement* in the past six years, one, J. A. W.

Bennett's *The Parlement of Foules* (Oxford, 1957), being the first full-length work on the poem. Others, C. O. McDonald, "An Interpretation of Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules*," *Speculum*, XXX (1955), 444-457, and R. W. Frank, Jr., "Structure and Meaning in the *Parlement of Foules*," *PMLA*, LXXI (1957), 530-539, are valuable analyses of methods and points of view, but with quite different approaches from that of the present essay. All are concerned with love and nature as the central themes. In addition, G. H. Stillwell has supplemented his earlier interpretation with another essay, "Chaucer's Eagles and Their Choice on February 14," *JEGP*, LIII (1954), 546-561.

[18]"The Role of the Narrator in the *Parlement of Foules*," *College English*, XIV (1953), 264-268.

[19]*Ibid.*, pp. 267-268.

[20]For a sane discussion of such deeply analytical readings of medieval literature, see M. W. Bloomfield, "Symbolism in Medieval Literature," *MP*, LVI (1958), 73-81.

[21]P. V. D. Shelly, *The Living Chaucer* (Philadelphia, 1940), p. 77.

[22]*Chaucer* (London, 1953).

[23]*Ibid.*, p. 84.

[24]*Ibid.*, pp. 84-85.

[25]*Ibid.*, p. 86.

[26]See my article, "Some Recent Interpretations of Chaucer's *Hous of Fame*," *University of Mississippi Studies in English*, I (1960), 97-104.

[27]"In Appreciation of the *Parlement of Foules*," pp. 195-197.

[28]"Chaucer's *Parlement of Foules*: A Philosophical Interpretation," p. 83.

[29]"Unity and Comedy in the *Parlement of Foules*," p. 474.

[30]B. H. Bronson, "The *Parlement of Foules* Revisited," sees this as an argument for a hypothetical revision of the poem.

[31]This distinction is clearly outlined by Boccaccio in the *Genealogia Deorum Gentilium*, Bk. III, Ch. 13-23. The distinction between the two Venuses is also made in the *Teseide* (Bari, 1941), pp. 417ff.

[32]This does not imply, however, that Chaucer, or the medieval man generally, would have argued that it is natural for one to marry out of one's class; this notion is largely a product of modern romanticism.

[33]Clemen, *op. cit.*, p. 184, argues that the parliament is a lively and realistic representation of the English Parliament of Chaucer's day, with its divisions into the various classes.

[34]*Chaucer*, p. 86.

Simms as Biographer

James W. Webb

During a period of five years (1844-1849), William Gilmore Simms put novel writing aside and produced four full-length biographies: *The Life of Francis Marion* (1844); *The Life of Captain John Smith, the Founder of Virginia* (1846); *The Life of Chevalier Bayard* (1847); and *The Life of Nathanael Greene, Major-General in the Army of the Revolution* (1849).

Before this period, however, he had exhibited an interest in biographical writing; and even after the publication of these four significant works, he continued to produce biographical sketches along with his many other activities. He even collected information and took notes for several biographies that never materialized. Writings on a number of subjects took the form of sketches and essays which eventually appeared in magazines and biographical dictionaries. Among the individuals that were at some time of more than passing interest as subjects to Simms were Washington Allston, John Andre, Daniel Boone, Christopher Gadsden, James Herring, Isaac Huger, John Laurens, John Paul Jones, Thaddeus Kosciusko, Charles Lee, James B. Longave, George McDuffie, William Moultrie, Andrew Pickens, C. C. Pinckney, Israel Putnam, Maynard Davis Richardson, Thomas Sumter, and Beverley Tucker. He wrote sketches of Daniel Boone and Cortes for *Views and Reviews* (1845).[1] Sketches of Huger, Lee and Pinckney, Gadsden, Sumter, Kosciusko, Greene, and Moultrie appeared in Rufus Griswold's *Washington and the Generals of the Revolution* (1847). A memoir of Maynard Davis Richardson was included in *The Remains of Maynard Davis Richardson* (1833). Most of these individuals were associated with the Revolutionary War; and more particularly, some of them were Simms's heroes of his beloved state of South Carolina.

The four subjects receiving full biographical treatment are historical figures that he admired and that he felt would be of lasting interest to American readers. Simms had remarked on one occasion that "it must be remembered that the national themes seem to be the most enduring."[2] Three of these subjects are figures in American history, if one considers John Smith to be an American. Bayard, a Frenchman, was of particular interest in connection with the French element in South Carolina and with the chivalric tradition that was being assiduously cultivated in the South before the Civil War. Simms himself, though of relatively humble circumstances in early life, married into a family of means and lived as an aristocrat until his home was destroyed by the war. His father had had dreams of establishing such a life for himself during the early days of the settlement of Mississippi when he acquired land in the vicinity of Raymond.

Simms was a widely read man as well as a prolific writer. In 1906, Oscar Wegelin ventured to say, "Without a single exception I think that Simms was the most voluminous writer that America has produced, his separate works alone reaching a total of over eighty titles, while his magazine articles and editorials cannot now be gathered together, so numerous are they."[3] As a creative writer he excelled in the field of historical fiction, and it is here that his reputation as a literary figure will ultimately rest. He wrote his best novels during the 1830's and early 1840's.

Simms turned to biographical writing at a time when novels were suffering a decline in sales. There were several possible reasons for this decline and for his turning to the production of biographies. Since there was no international copyright law at the time, popular British novels were being reprinted in the United States more cheaply than American novels could be written and published. Furthermore, according to Professor William P. Trent, "American competitors were becoming more numerous, and there were already signs that the romantic school was beginning to lose its hold upon the world."[4] Simms

may, therefore, have thought that it was time for something new. Trent also suggests that the reading public did not have a high regard for some of Simms's novels and that "South Carolina disdained to read such things."[5] Vernon L. Parrington has written that the "coarse fare" of Simms's novels, especially the low characters he described, was too much for the taste of Southern aristocrats[6] and that such romantic strains as the melodramatic and "luridly picaresque" traits prevailed in the novel "till the popular taste was so debauched that Gilmore Simms found it well-nigh impossible to struggle against it."[7] It will also be remembered that about this time in America, magazines, annuals, and gift books were thriving. Fiction in the form of short stories was appearing in large part through these media. In a letter to George Frederick Holmes, dated October 27, 1843, Simms wrote, "Novel writing at present is not encouraging by its results and beyond a few short stories I have done nothing for some time."[8] However, during the next ten years, he kept many irons in the fire. He edited two magazines and began a third; contributed editorials, criticisms, and other items to his own and to other magazines; continued writing novelettes, short stories, and poetry; wrote a geography, a history of South Carolina, and four biographies; travelled and delivered addresses; participated in South Carolina politics (in 1846 he missed being elected lieutenant-governor by one vote); and looked after his plantation interests. It appears, however, that "from the point of view of his contemporaries the most important work done by Simms during these crowded years is perhaps to be found in his four biographies."[9] During the middle years of the nineteenth century, history and biography were among the most popular literary forms. Prominent writers of this period were Prescott, Bancroft, Irving, Motley, Parkman, and Sparks. The versatile Simms saw an opportunity to make use of his interest in history by writing biography.

It should be noted that Simms's turning from novel writing to biography was not at all an abrupt transition in his writing career. His interest in the history and the romantic hero stories of South

Carolina had been lifelong. As a boy, he had listened to stories from his grandmother, from his father, and from the old soldiers of Francis Marion, the leader of the partisans in the hit-and-run guerilla warfare against Cornwallis, Rawdon, and Watson. As a youth he "had frequently rambled over the ground" covered by these men.[10] They afforded an abundance of ready material for his historical novels. Simms's letters to his friends indicate an interest in Southern leaders of the American Revolution several years before the publication of his first biography in 1844. The materials collected for his historical novels, for his history, and for his geography of South Carolina served as spadework for his biographies of Francis Marion and Nathanael Greene. An awareness of these facts will prevent one from concluding that the publication of four full-length biographies, along with many other activities within a period of five years, was too phenomenal for one author. One can be sure that his theories of historical and biographical writing had been fairly well developed by this time. Most of his ideas on the subject were published in 1845, in his *Views and Reviews in American Literature, History and Fiction.*[11]

Of no small consideration is the reception or the popularity of Simms's biographies by the readers of his time. His first, *The Life of Francis Marion,* was published by Henry G. Langley, New York, 1844. This was his first attempt at a full length biography, and according to A. S. Salley's record, it went through eleven editions during the years, 1844-1855.[12] In one of Simms's letters, dated July 2, 1847, he wrote:

> Marion has a proverbial reputation, & my book has gone to ten editions, though that of Old Weems had been in the market & extensively popular for more than 30 years. It is worth quite as much as Smith and both books will find readers to a regular amount annually, for fifty years to come.[13]

There was also one edition or printing (whether edition or printing is not made clear) each year from 1856 until the year 1860.[14] Hence,

this biography appears to have been popular with readers over a period of years.

His second full-length biography, *The Life of Captain John Smith, the Founder of Virginia,* was published by George F. Cooledge and Brother, Booksellers and Publishers, New York, 1846. It was bound in fancy covers with engraved title and contained thirteen plates. The sixth edition was published in 1855 and the seventh in 1890. Two undated editions were published. According to A. S. Salley's *Catalogue,* there appears to have been a total of thirteen editions and printings.[15] In 1846, very little was known about Smith and the early Jamestown Colony. Simms saw an opportunity to supply a need. He felt that the romantic aspects of history could be conveniently told through the medium of outstanding personages. In a review of this biography, Evert A. Duyckinck referred to it as a "highly agreeable, instructive popular history, related with a fund of good humor, which proceeds from a love of the subject, and an instinctive knowledge of the man, from a sympathy with his chivalry and energy."[16] Simms made no pretense of writing anything other than a narrative history of Smith and his exploits told chronologically. He made very little use of conjecture. In his "Advertisement," he wrote that "As much of Smith's own language as could be employed has been made use of without scruple, and with little alteration."[17] Since the author was primarily interested in Smith's role in American colonization, he devoted more space to this phase of Smith's life and less to his European adventures. He wrote that it was "a favorite part of the plan . . . to make the account of the Discovery, Settlement, and Progress of Virginia as copious as possible, consistently with the claims of biography."[18]

The Life of the Chevalier Bayard; "The Good Knight, Sans Peur et Sans Reproche" was published in 1847, by Harper and Brothers, Publishers. This first edition contained a portrait of Bayard and thirteen half-page illustrations. Subsequent editions appeared in 1854 and 1860. An undated edition appeared also, making a

total of four. This biography was evidently not as well received as his others; however, in his letters to friends, Simms devoted more space to the discussion of this one than he did to any of his others. He evidently admired Bayard as the perfect example of chivalry. There was much about the life and exploits of this Frenchman that was attractive to South Carolinians. They must have taken a vicarious interest in his courtly manners, the cavalry charges and the "first families." The Bayard influence extended beyond South Carolina and the South. A Unionist, Charles Anderson, who had seen Robert E. Lee in Texas before the Civil War wrote, "And of all the officers or men whom I ever knew, he came (save for one alone) the nearest in likeness to that classical ideal, Chevalier Bayard . . . ."[19]

The Life of Nathanael Greene, Major-General in the Army of the Revolution,[20] edited by W. Gilmore Simms, Esq. was first published in 1849 by George F. Cooledge & Brother. According to Salley's *Catalogue,* the work was reissued in 1856, 1858, 1859 and 1861; and there is one printing which is not dated.[21] Just why Simms had his name placed on the title page as editor is not known. Professor Trent, in his biography of Simms, writes that

> *The Life of Nathanael Greene* . . . deserves a special paragraph only from the fact that it purports to be edited by Simms. There is, however, no reason to believe that he did not write it. He speaks, it is true, of "revising for the publishers the manuscript of the present work;" but Simms's earmarks are visible through the whole of it, and he had had such a biography in contemplation for years. Be this as it may, the book is an orthodox and decorous biography, and, on the whole, well written.[22]

Only three biographies of Greene had been written before Simms's effort—those by Charles Caldwell (1819), William Johnson (1822), and George W. Greene, a grandson (1846). George Greene expanded his work to a formal three-volume biography (1867-1871); and in 1893, a small biography of 332 pages by Francis V. Greene appeared.[23]

It appears that General Greene, who was of great value in winning the Revolutionary War, was somewhat neglected by hero worshippers after the war and these biographers were attempting to direct attention to him and gain for him the credit he deserved. Simms employed the narrative method. Chronology is observed. As he did in *Marion,* the author indulges in his old love of giving details of military operations and in so doing emphasizes Greene's solid character as one of Washington's most reliable assistants. As far as popularity and sales are concerned, Simms's *Life of Greene* was disappointing. George W. Greene's two biographies of his grandfather, appearing just before and just after Simms's, tended to neutralize it. There was no demand for it after the Civil War. It was his last attempt to write a full length biography, although he did keep alive his interest in biographical writing.

Simms had a theory of history and biography which he expressed in the prefaces to his historical novels and biographies, in his *History of South Carolina* and in his *Views and Reviews in American Literature, History and Fiction.* Since he lived and wrote during a period of hero worship, he conceived of biography as a means of viewing and writing history. His view of history was through the lives of great men; therefore, his principles applied to history and to biography in very much the same manner. In order that biography might present history, he insisted that it must be factual. Simms "approached his task with a deep respect for historical accuracy."[24] He was conscious of this aspect of biographical writing when he, in the preface to *The Life of Francis Marion,* pointed out the necessity of distinguishing between legend and fact. Obviously he had a respect for research and accuracy in his preparations for writing his account of Francis Marion. Some of the difficulties in gathering materials appear to have been the result of the long period of British occupation. South Carolina had been

> too long subject to ravages of civil and foreign war, to have preserved many of those minor records which concern only

> the renown of individuals, and are unnecessary to the comprehension of great events; and the vague tributes of unquestioning tradition are not adequate authorities for the biographer, whose laws are perhaps even more strict than those which govern the historian.[25]

His chief sources were "the various histories of Carolina and Georgia," "private manuscripts," "much unpublished correspondence," and the two previous biographies of Francis Marion by Mason Locke Weems and William D. James.[26] In his "Note," following the table of contents, Simms includes a bibliography of some seventeen items as sources for his biography of Marion. The items listed by Simms represent the best sources available to him. More recent investigations have indicated that "Every work listed in the bibilography on the War in the South (1776-1780); in C. H. Van Tyne, *The American Revolution, 1776-1783*, (New York, 1905), 350, that was available when Simms wrote appears in the note in Marion."[27] Indeed, Francis Marion was an appropriate character for biographical treatment. By Simms's time he had become a legendary figure. Simms could see the value of Marion's exploits to enliven the pages of Southern history; and by using him as the subject for a biography, Simms was contributing to a body of history and literature of the South at a time when others were inclined to overlook the important role of the South in the ultimate defeat of Cornwallis.

Simms follows a very similar procedure of research and documentation for all his full-length biographies. Even in his historical novels, he made an attempt to be accurate in his facts. In the preface to *The Partisan* he writes: "sober desire for history — the unwritten — the unconsidered, but veracious history — has been with me, in this labour, a sort of Principle."[28] In delineating his characters, he assures the reader that he "followed the best authorities."[29] There is no evidence of any deliberate departure from recorded facts for the purpose of impressing readers, for teaching morality, or for any other extraneous purpose that tends to produce an impure biography. This

statement is not intended to imply that Simms wrote pure biography or that biography might not serve any purpose other than merely presenting the portrait of an individual. Nevertheless, it can hardly be said that Simms wrote with complete detachment. He was a romantic; he admired heroes and he used them and their historical deeds to glorify the South, and especially, his native state. However, it does not appear that he altered recorded facts. For example, in his account of the seige of Fort Moultrie, he did not, as did Weems, bring in without assistance from history forty-two pounders to boom over the roaring waves in order to make greater the fury of a battle for the amazement of readers.

A number of footnotes were used throughout the first half of the biography *The Life of Francis Marion,* most of them referring to Mason Locke Weems, James, Moultrie, and Peter Horry. Weems was often quoted for the sake of disagreement. Horry had served under the command of General Marion as brigadier general in the guerilla wars in South Carolina and had preserved a rough account of Marion and his activities, hoping eventually to write a biography. Later, however, realizing a lack of skill and temperament, he allowed Weems to use his material. But he was much displeased with what Weems did with it. It is evident that Simms kept Weems in mind with the idea of correcting errors regarding facts and toning down instances where Weems became too much carried away with his rhetoric and exaggerated situations for the credulity of careful readers. It might be stated here somewhat parenthetically that Weems wrote his biographies to preach morality regardless of means, to entertain the masses of his day, and to sell. He was quite successful, particularly in the matter of entertaining and selling. Among other references to Weems, Simms stated

> Of the two works devoted especially to our subject, that by the Rev. Mr. Weems is most generally known—a delightful book for the young. The author seems not to have contemplated any less credulous readers, and its general

> character is such as naturally to inspire us with frequent doubts of its statements. Mr. Weems had rather loose notions of the privileges of the biographer; though, in reality, he has transgressed much less in his life of Marion than is generally supposed. But the untamed, and sometimes extravagant exuberance of his style might well subject his narrative to suspicion. Of the "sketch" by the Hon. Judge James, we are more secure, though as a literary performance, it is quite as devoid of merit as pretension. Besides, the narrative is not thorough. It dwells somewhat too minutely upon one class of facts, to the neglect or the exclusion of every other. I have made both of these works tributary to my own whenever this was possible.[30]

This attitude, however, did not cause Simms to rule out imagination and judicious speculation. He was aware that "much of most histories is built upon conjecture — that this conjecture, assuming bolder privileges, becomes romance — that all ages and nations have possessed this romance. . . ."[31] Elsewhere, he writes that "the privileges of the romancer only begin where those of the historian cease."[32] Brought together, these statements leave room for conjecture, but it has to be a very modest amount and must be kept under control. Furthermore, according to Simms, a certain amount of judicious conjecture is necessary. This is obviously what he meant when he stated that the philosophy of history is "happy conjecturing."[33] By the word *happy* he no doubt meant a judicious amount. To put it another way, the biographer may use his imagination but it must be under control, must do no violence to facts, and must not run riot. With the allowance of "happy conjecturing," Simms paves the way for artists to enter the field of biographers and historians. This was a part of the process of recreation and animation. He also recognized the danger of legendary material in a biography and, as already stated, referred to it in his preface to his *Life of Francis Marion*. However, he believed that a moderate amount of legendary

or traditional material along with "happy conjecturing" is of value in filling gaps and completing a portrait if it cannot be disproved and if it does not contradict "facts which are known and decisive."[34] He was in accord with other literary historians in believing the use of these matters is oftentimes necessary to give a three-dimensional effect to the subject by clothing the skeleton with flesh and by allowing the subject to breathe.[35]

The concept of the artist appears in Simms's theory of writing history when he stated that "it is the artist only who is the true historian. It is he who gives shape to the unhewn fact, — who yields relation to scattered fragments,—who unites the parts in coherent dependency and endows, with life and action the otherwise motionless automata of history."[36] According to Simms, it is this treatment that keeps histories from being merely chronicles or annals.

Simms believed that by careful selection of the subject and by good writing, biography would serve to teach and inspire the reader. He cared not "so much for the intrinsic truth of history, as for the great moral truths which drawn from such sources, induce excellence in the students."[37] More specifically, he wrote that biography served to provoke inquiry, excite curiosity, awaken noble affections, elicit generous sentiments, and stimulate "into becoming activity the intelligence which it inspires."[38] Even for the young, he felt that history served a useful purpose in "making vivid impressions upon pliant fancies of childhood."[39] He had a true sense of history. He drew all his subjects from the past and showed a predilection for heroic personalities, and chivalry, and picturesque events. Each of the individuals that he selected for biographical treatment was involved in military conflict at some time during his career. This conflict was remote enough to be seen in a romantic light despite the gruesome events that the biographer had occasion to refer to from time to time. By his biography of Francis Marion, he was of the opinion that by calling attention to the important role played by the South, which had been somewhat overlooked while Concord and Bunker Hill were

much celebrated; and at the same time, he felt that he was contributing to the total body of early American national history and literature. In fact, he took up the plea for Americanism in literature.

In summing up Simms's venture into biographical writing, it is apparent from his own statements and from his practice that he had definite theories and purposes. He emphasized the idea that the true historian is an artist who gives form to scattered and unhewn facts. It was his belief and practice that biography could be enlivened by a finished literary style, interesting anecdote and episode, and a romantic coloring to make pleasant reading so long as it does not violate facts. He believed that biography could be as interesting as fiction and other literary forms and that at the same time it could inform and even teach, although one writer has suggested that some of Simms's didacticism "may have been lip service to the convention of his age."[40] However, one must ever keep in mind that Simms was writing for and contributing to the needs of his time. It is clearly evident that he gave much thought to the matter of historical and biographical writing before and during the period when he wrote his four biographies. In developing his theory of historical and biographical writing and in his deliberate attempt to put his theory into practice in his four popular biographies, Simms was contributing to the body of historical biographies written by mid-nineteenth century historians who gave attention to accuracy and literary finish.

FOOTNOTES

[1]W. Gilmore Simms, "Daniel Boon [sic]; the First Hunter of Kentucky," pp. 118-142; and "Cortes and the Conquest of Mexico," pp. 143-209, in *Views and Reviews in American Literature, History and Fiction* (New York, 1845).

[2]*Ibid.*, p. 36.

[3]Oscar Wegelin, *A List of the Separate Writings of William Gilmore Simms of South Carolina,* 1860-1870 (New York, 1906), p. viii.

[4]William P. Trent, *William Gilmore Simms* (Boston and New York, 1892), p. 127.

[5]*Ibid.*, p. 129.

[6]Vernon Louis Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought, an Interpretation of American Literature from the Beginnings to 1920* (New York, 1939), II, 129.

[7]*Ibid.*, II, 190.

[8]Mary C. Simms Oliphant and others (eds.), *The Letters of William Gilmore Simms* (Columbia, 1952), I, 171.

[9]Trent, *William Gilmore Simms*, p. 138.

[10]William Gilmore Simms, *The Partisan: A Tale of the Revolution* (New York, 1936), p. viii.

[11]First Series (New York, 1845).

[12]A. S. Salley, *Catalogue of the Salley Collection of the Works of William Gilmore Simms* (Columbia, 1943), pp. 110-111.

[13]Simms's *Letters*, II, 250.

[14]Salley, *Catalogue*, p. 112.

[15]*Ibid.*, pp. 113-115.

[16]Review of "Simms's *Life of Captain John Smith*" in *The Literary World*, I (March 27, 1847), 222.

[17]W. Gilmore Simms, *The Life of Captain John Smith, The Founder of Virginia* (7th ed.; Philadelphia, 1865), "Advertisement," following title page.

[18]*Loc. cit.*

[19]Quoted in Dixon Wecter's *The Hero in America, A Chronicle of Hero-Worship* (New York, 1941), p. 282.

[20]There have been variant spellings of the name *Nathanael*. Reviewers of Simms's book, and others of the time and since have spelled the name *Nathaniel*. I have examined some of General Greene's official correspondence, now in the possession of his great-granddaughter, Miss Katherine Skipwith of Oxford, Mississippi, and found that General Greene always signed his letters "Nath Greene"; but members of the family spelled it *Nathanael*, and so it is spelled on his tomb in Savannah, Georgia. Simms, it will be observed, is correct in this detail.

[21]Salley, *Catalogue*, pp. 116-117.

[22]Trent, *Life of Simms*, pp. 139-140.

[23]Edward H. O'Neill, *Biography by Americans 1658-1936, A Subject Bibliography* (Philadelphia, 1939), p. 165.

[24]C. Hugh Holman, "William Gilmore Simms' Picture of the Revolution as a Civil Conflict," *Journal of Southern History*, XV (November, 1949), 441.

[25]W. Gilmore Simms, *The Life of Francis Marion* (New York, 1845), Preface.

[26]*Loc. cit.*

[27]Holman, "William Gilmore Simms' Picture of the Revolution as a Civil Conflict," p. 443.

[28]Simms, *The Partisan*, p. lx.

[29]*Loc. cit.*

[30]Simms, *The Life of Francis Marion*, Preface.

[31]Simms, *Views and Reviews*, p. 34.

[32]*Ibid.*, p. 42.

[33]*Ibid.*, p. 25.

[34]*Ibid.*, p. 26.

[35]John Spencer Bassett, "Later Historians," *Cambridge History of American Literature* (New York, 1936), III, 190.

[36]Simms, *Views and Reviews*, p. 25.

[37]*Ibid.*, p. 26.
[38]*Ibid.*, p. 25.
[39]*Ibid.*, p. 9.
[40]John Rushing Welsh, *The Mind of William Gilmore Simms: His Social and Political Thought* (Nashville, Tennessee: The Joint University Libraries, 1952), p. 15; a summary of a doctoral thesis, Vanderbilt University.